UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

THE LATIN PERFECT ENDINGS -ERE AND -ERUNT

CHARLES FRANCIS BAUER

A THESIS
IN LATIN
PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

PHILADELPHIA
1933

THE LATIN PERFECT ENDINGS -ERE AND -ERUNT

A THESIS

IN LATIN

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

CHARLES FRANCIS BAUER

Reprint of *Language Dissertation No. 13*
published by the Linguistic Society of America
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia

PHILADELPHIA

1933

PRINTED IN FRANCE

The writer wishes to acknowledge his obligation and to express his sincere gratitude to Professor John C. Rolfe, Professor Walton B. McDaniel, Professor Roland G. Kent, Professor George D. Hadzsits, Professor Harry B. Van Deventer, Professor Edward H. Heffner, Professor Robert B. Burke, Assistant Professor Merle M. Odgers, and Dr. Harrison B. Ash of the University of Pennsylvania for helpful criticism and advice given to him during the preparation of this dissertation. His greatest debt is to Professor Kent, at whose suggestion the work was begun, under whose special guidance it proceeded, and whose generous coöperation and constant encouragement have made possible its completion.

C. F. B.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS

The books and articles in this list are those to which frequent reference is made in this dissertation. Titles of works to which reference is rarely made, are given only in the footnotes. Additional bibliographic material will be found in some of the works which are listed here.

Goetz, G., and F. Schoell : T. Macci Plauti Comoediae ; in Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana ; 7 vols. ; Leipzig, 1901-14. (Generally known as the small edition.)

Havet, L. : Le Parfait en *-ere* chez Plaute ; in Revue de Philologie, 31.230-3 (1907).

Lane, G. M. : A Latin Grammar for Schools and Colleges ; rev. ed. by M. H. Morgan ; New York, 1903.

Leo, F. : T. Macci Plauti Comoediae ; 2 vols. ; Berlin, 1895-6.

Leumann, M. : see F. Stolz.

Lindsay, W. M. : T. Macci Plauti Comoediae ; in Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis ; 2 vols. ; Oxford, 1913.

Lindsay, W. M. : Early Latin Verse ; Oxford, 1922. (With bibliography.)

Muller, F., J. fil. : Stili Differentia Quatenus ex Historia Terminationis Cuiusdam (-ēre, -ĕrunt) Appareat ; in Mnemosyne, n. s. 56.329-89 (1928). (With bibliography ; the first installment of an extensive treatise.)

Ritschl, F. : T. Macci Plauti Comoediae ; revised and completed by G. Loewe, G. Goetz, and F. Schoell ; 4 vols. : Leipzig, 1881-94. (Generally known as the large edition.)

Sommer, F. : Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre ; 2nd ed. ; Heidelberg, 1914.

Stolz, F. : Lateinische Grammatik; Laut- und Formenlehre; 5th ed., revised by M. Leumann. In vol. 2, part 2 of W. Otto's Handbuch

der Altertumswissenschaft, 39-344 ; Munich, 1928. (With virtually complete references.)

Tyrrell, R. Y. : P. Terenti Afri Comoediae; in Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis ; Oxford, 1902.

Tyrrell, R. Y. : The Miles Gloriosus of T. Maccius Plautus ; 3d ed.; London, 1899.

Reference by an author's name usually indicates the only work by that author which is mentioned in the Bibliography.

Lindsay, without further citation, indicates the Oxford text of Plautus, and the verse in question, or a critical note on it ; when scansion is involved, the reference is to the 'Schema Metrorum' at the end of the volumes of the Oxford text.

Lindsay ELV, refers to his Early Latin Verse.

Loewe, Goetz, or Schoell, refers to the verse under discussion or note on the verse, in the large revised edition of Ritschl's Plautus (1881-94).

Goetz and Schoell, with the date of publication of the section involved in parentheses, indicates the small Teubner edition of Plautus (1901-14).

The quantity of the vowel preceding the endings *-runt* and *-re* is generally indicated by the customary signs.

The *e* of the ending *-erunt* is written *ĕ̄* to include both *-ērunt* and *-ĕrunt*.

The *e* of *-erunt* is left unmarked when the quantity of the *e* is explained in the context, or is doubtful, or when it is not desirable to express a judgment (as in prose citations).

Long vowels are regularly marked in letters or groups of letters that are only parts of words ; otherwise the quantities of the vowels are marked only for distinction, or for special clearness.

In the List (§8-§11), the mark ◡ is also used to indicate that a long syllable is shortened (iambic shortening), or that a semi-elided final long vowel is shortened before a word beginning with a vowel.

Where it is both possible and desirable to indicate the syllabic values, *j* and *v* are written for consonantal *i* and *u*.

Numerals are used alone to indicate a verse in Plautus or Terence by its numerical position in the List (§8-§11), or the perfect form which appears in the verse ; t is added to those numbers which refer to verses or forms in Terence. The abbreviation No. precedes the number if there is any possible ambiguity.

Numerals preceded by § without further qualification, indicate a section of this dissertation.

A raised final *-e* of the ending *-ēre* (*ēr*ᵉ) is generally used to distinguish the elided form from the unelided form. But in the List (§8-§11), the elided *-e* as well as other elided endings are italicized. The distinction between elided and unelided *-ēre* is observed only in the discussion of the usages in Plautus, Terence, and Phaedrus (§79-§81).

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Aim

§1. The purpose of this treatise is to discuss the use in Plautus and Terence of the endings of the third person plural perfect indicative active : *-ēre*, *-ērunt*, and *-ĕrunt*. The relation of these three endings in Latin has remained doubtful [1], chiefly because it has been impossible to determine their relation in the comedies of Plautus and Terence, the earliest Latin literary works that have survived in fairly complete form. No complete and thoroughgoing presentation of the material available for a study of the endings in these authors has appeared. It was therefore the hope of the present writer that a careful examination of all the verses in which the forms occur, might yield new results, or at least more precise information on the occurrences of each ending. My conclusions regarding the number of times each ending occurs in Plautus and Terence do not differ essentially from conclusions previously reached, but the material seems to be definite and extensive enough to justify an attempt to account for the use of the endings. The evidence found to explain this has determined the present form of my treatise. In view of the complicated nature of the problems concerned, I have preferred to present the facts first, then to deduce probable explanations for the usages in Plautus and in Terence. Finally, some suggestions are added as to the possibility of applying the explanations derived from these authors to established facts concerning the later history of the endings.

1. Leumann-Stolz, §246 : Das Verhältnis von *-ērunt -ĕrunt* und *-ēre* ist nicht aufgeklärt. But there is a generally accepted theory of the origin of the three endings which is questioned by the present writer (§47-§51).

B. Method

§2. The readings adopted are based primarily upon the Oxford texts of Plautus and of Terence, by Lindsay and Tyrrell respectively. The large edition of Ritschl's Plautus, revised by Loewe, Goetz, and Schoell, has also been consulted, especially for more complete critical notes than those found in Lindsay's text. But the reading adopted in the large edition is not always considered when a change has been made in the small Teubner edition by Goetz and Schoell (1901-14); the testimony of the latter is always preferred where the readings of the Ambrosian palimpsest (A) are involved. [2]

I have assumed that the text as handed down by the manuscripts is fundamentally sound, and is to be accepted wherever reasonably possible. On this basis, I find no reason to reject any of the prologues because of the forms of the perfect tense which they contain. Freedom in emendation and rejection may sometimes remove difficulties, but it does not always add to our knowledge of the language of Plautus. However, the scansion of the verses according to established metrical principles does not often permit any variation in the readings of the perfect. The notable exception is the form in *-ēre* before a consonant. Since this ending in this position is rare in Plautus and Terence, I have considered *-ēre* a decidedly more difficult reading than *-ērunt*, and have sometimes adopted *ēre* even on the basis of only one manuscript.

§3. In general, I have followed the metrical principles set forth in Lindsay's Early Latin Verse. Only one of these is of any particular importance in connection with the study of the perfect endings: namely, Luchs's Law ('das Luchsianische Gesetz')[3], which is involved quite frequently. According to this principle, when a senarius or a trochaic septenarius ends in an iambic or a pyrrhic word, the unaccented half of the fifth and sixth foot respectively must not consist of a single short syllable. When the ending *-erunt* occurs before this final iambic word, the *e* of this ending must be considered long even though the long antepenult, or the initial syllable of quadrisyllabic

2. Cf. Goetz and Schoell (1901), preface to volume three: Manuscript A was reëxamined, and the testimony of Loewe (used in the large edition) was found to be unreliable.

3. A. Luchs, Quaestiones Metricae; in Vol. I of W. Studemund's Studien 1-75; Berlin, 1873. Lindsay ELV 105, 270-2.

forms beginning with two short syllables, receives the verse ictus (e. g., *occépērúnt ratém* 21 ; *tétigērúnt tenént* 14). Only one of the exceptions to this Law which are recognized by Lindsay may affect some of the perfect forms ; this is discussed later (§41. b).

Iambic shortening apparently did not have any effect upon the perfect ending in even a single instance.[4]

§4. So far as possible, I have followed the principle of coincidence of word accent and verse ictus.[5] The accent on the initial syllable of quadrisyllabic words beginning with three short syllables[6], has also been considered. Since this accent is not invariable, no assumptions have been made on this basis without some investigation, the results of which will be presented later (§41. a). Though the existence of a phrase accent must be recognized, I can see little possibility of the influence of such an accent on the perfect forms ; third plural perfects usually have the verse ictus on the syllable which would receive the accent in prose, unless the meter permits or requires clash of ictus and accent.[7]

C. General Background

§5. Any problem involving the language of Plautus and Terence cannot be solved by mechanical means alone. For that reason, a few general remarks concerning the background assumed are necessary. The fact that the Latin language had not become as fixed and regular in the time of Plautus as it was in the age of Cicero and Vergil, is most important in connection with the present study. There were in his day neither schools nor an established literature to promote regularity and uniformity, and to check natural linguistic change. A literary language had been developed to some extent in tragedy and epic, but these branches of literature had little influence upon the speech used in the comedies of Plautus. Tragedy and epic tend to use more elevated and formal language, to borrow from that of

4. Cf. §40. b.

5. E. H. Sturtevant, Accent and Ictus in Plautus and Terence ; in Classical Philology 14.234-44 (1919).

6. Leumann-Stolz §163 c (page 188), with references. Cf. also Sturtevant, op. cit. 238-9.

7. I. e., in anapaestic meter, or according to Luchs's Law (§46).

religion and law (cf. §18-§20), but comedy follows colloquial usage primarily. Plautus is, above all, a poet of the common people. We can expect to find in his works, so far as the meter allows, a fairly accurate reflection of colloquial usage, even slang when it suits his purpose. The same is not true of Terence who ‘eschews the vulgar and polishes the choice language of aristocratic culture to finesse’.[8] However, it must be admitted that there is no great difference between the language of Plautus and that of Terence so far as forms of words and accentuation are concerned. The latter also uses ordinary conversational Latin rather than the decidedly formal diction of tragedy and epic.[9] But when there is a distinction between the language of the more conservative classes and that of the common people, Terence may be expected to lean toward the former and to avoid the latter. Evidence of such distinction may be looked for in the use of endings like those of the third plural perfect, which were not used in the same way by the two poets (§12), and which were, in my opinion, undergoing some change at that time.

§6. The probable influence of metrical requirements on the use of any form, especially when there is a choice between several forms, cannot be disregarded. However, this influence on the language of Plautus is, I believe, often overestimated. Though Plautus and Terence were pioneers in the adaptation of Greek meters to conversational Latin and vice versa, it is not to be imagined that the difficulties of composition were as great as those experienced by early Latin writers who composed dactylic verse. With a few changes in the meter, and greater freedom in resolution and substitution than in Greek verse, iambic and trochaic meters were well adapted to the Latin language, so far, at any rate, as quantitative requirements are concerned.

One point in particular leads me to suspect that there was a rhythmic tendency in colloquial Latin before the influence of the Greek

8. J. W. Duff, A Literary History of Rome 214 ; New York, 1928.

9. Yet the possibility that Terence also represents a tendency to develop a somewhat artificial literary language, much less pronounced than the same tendency in tragedy and epic, cannot be disregarded. Whether the cause is attributable to speech practices in the language of conservative classes, or to a beginning of an artificial literary language, or to both, the result (the fact that the language of Terence is somewhat more conservative than that of Plautus) is the same so far as the present study is concerned.

meters was felt. A number of examples to be pointed out (§23) are apparently proverbs or adages, and it is not inconceivable that such sayings should tend to be rhythmic in form. An iambic or trochaic rhythm, in theory a succession of alternately accented and unaccented syllables, is the simplest and most natural. Employment of such a rhythmic series in the formation of frequently recurring phrases, is not improbable. Perhaps the variations in accent which may be observed in Plautus are also involved. Plautus may not be so much a pioneer in composing iambic and trochaic verse in Latin as he is usually believed to be.[10] It is not absolutely necessary, therefore, to assume that in the use of the perfect endings Plautus violated colloquial usage to any extent for metrical reasons, nor that Terence followed extremes of colloquial speech for the same reasons.

D. Conclusions

§7. *-ēre* (including *-ēr^e^*) was an old ending which had almost disappeared from colloquial Latin at the time of Plautus and Terence.

-ērunt (earlier *-ēront*) was developed from *-ēre* in Early Latin by analogy with the *-unt* (*-ont*) endings of the present indicative, and had become the prevailing form in colloquial Latin at the time of Plautus and Terence. The frequent use of *-ēre* (including *-ēr^e^*) in Terence may be attributed to the more conservative tendencies of that author, and to the fact that the variation between *-ēr^e^* and *-ērunt* was convenient metrically.

-ĕrunt originated from the short ('contracted') forms of *-v-* perfects such as those in *-ārunt*, by analogy with other forms of the perfect tenses in *-āvĕrant* etc.; this development took place in the colloquial language spoken in Rome, during the lifetime of Plautus, or a very short time before.

This theory of the origin and early history of the perfect endings seems to furnish a firm basis for the history of the forms found in later Latin literature and in the Romanic languages.

10. For a summary of the evidence which suggests a prehistory of Latin metrics on Italian soil before the time of Livius Andronicus, with particular emphasis on the iambic senarius and the trochaic septenarius, cf. F. Altheim : Die neuesten Forschungen zur Vorgeschichte der römischen Metrik ; in Glotta 19. 24-48 (1931).

II. LIST OF FORMS IN PLAUTUS AND TERENCE

§8. PROCEDURE : The purpose of this List with the footnotes is merely to present the textual material and to indicate the scansion of the verses on which the present study is based. Alternative readings or scansions which do not in any way affect the perfect form in the verse, are not usually mentioned, and the readings (including the punctuation) which I have adopted are those of Lindsay. Even where perfect forms are involved, I have not always mentioned obviously erroneous manuscript readings.

Since the purpose of this study is to determine the usages of Plautus and of Terence, emendations by modern scholars are frequently disregarded. But emendations which have been generally accepted, are sometimes adopted without any notation other than the customary textual symbol.

When either synizesis or iambic shortening is metrically possible, I have regularly scanned words such as *eo* and *meus*, as dissyllables with iambic shortening, for the sake of simplicity. For the same reason, when either hiatus or elision is metrically possible, I have regularly scanned with elision, unless hiatus or semi-hiatus seems metrically desirable. [1]

The meter is indicated merely by the accent marks in iambic or trochaic verses ; other meters are indicated in parentheses at the end of the verse, or in the footnote.

Details regarding the procedure which I have followed in order to determine the scansion of *periĕrunt* 5, *tetigērunt* 14, and other words whose perfect stem consists of two short syllables, are given in §41-§41. d.

1. E. g., to avoid the division between two words, of two short syllables which stand for a long. I admit that complete elision of finals of emphatic monosyllables and of some diphthongs may be doubtful, but such problems are outside the scope of the present study.

§9. The Occurrences in Plautus :

1 : Am. 92 Jov*em* ÍNVOCĀ′RUNT, vénit, áuxili*o* ís fuít.

2 : Am. 184 quoniám benĕ qu*ae* ín me FÉCĔRÚNT [2] || ingrát*a* *ea* hábu*i* atqu*e* ínritá.

3 : Am. 211 haec úbĭ Telóbois órdiné || ITERĀ′RUNT quós praefécerát

4 : Am. 216 haec úbĭ legáti PÉRTULĒ′R*e*, Amphítruo cástris ílicó

5 : Am. 338 ílicét : mandát*a* erí PERIĒ′RUNT ún*a* et Sósiá.

6 : Am. 1018 mórtuóm satiúst. sed áedis ÓCCLUSĒ′RUNT. éugepáe,

7 : As. 79 patrés ut CÓNSVEVĒ′RUNT [3] : égŏ mitt*o* ómni*a* háec.

8 : As. 316 háriolári qu*ae* ÓCCEPĒ′RUNT síbĭ | ess*e* ín mundó malúm.

9 : As. 342 téne*o*. atqu*e* ídem *te* hínc VEXĒ′RUNT vínctum rús. memor és probé.

10 : As. 419 qui látera cónterám tuá, | qu*ae* OCCÁLLUĒ′RE plágis.

11 : As. 552 qui sáep*e* ant*e* ín nostrás scaplás cicātríces ÍNDIDĒ′RUNT,

12 : As. 633 argénti vígintí mináe med ád mort*em* ÁPPULĒ′RUNT,

13 : As. 727 ut CÓNSVEVĒ′R*e* [4], hominés Salús frustrátur ét Fortúna.

14 : Au. 198 ég*o* ĭstos nóvi pólypos quĭ′ | ubi quícquid TÉTIGĒRÚNT tenént.

15 : Au. 346 dicánt : coqu*i* ÁPSTULĒ′RUNT, cómprehéndité,

16 : Au. 376 atqu*e* éŏ FUĒ′RUNT cáriór*a*, aes nón erát.

17 : Au. 409 íta me míser*um* et méŏs discípulos fústibús malĕ CÓNTUDĒ′RUNT.

18 : Au. 542 qu*i* habént, MEMINĒ′RUNT [5] sés*e* und*e* óriundí siént.

19 : Au. 753 nón m*i* hominés placént qui quándo málĕ FECĒ′RUNT púrigánt.

20 : Ba. 256 sceléstiórem núll*um* INLÚXĒR*e* álterúm.

21 : Ba. 292 quoniám vidént nos stár*e*, OCCÉPĒRÚNT ratém

22 : Ba. 297 aur*um* hércl*e* auférre VÓLUĒR*e* : éi *rei* operám dabánt.

2. Fleckeisen, Philologus 2.75 (1847), emended the first half of this verse to : *quom qúae in me fecĕrunt bene*, to avoid the form *fecĕrunt*, because he found no other trisyllabic *-ĕrunt* perfect in Plautus. I can see no reason why the number of syllables in the word should have any relation to the perfect ending used. Cf. *emĕrunt* 198 t, and *fecĕrunt* 74.

3. Mss. *consuerunt* ; cf. §36. a.

4. Mss. *consuere* ; cf. §36. a.

5. Goetz and others adopt *meminerint*, the reading of B. The jussive subjunctive *meminerint* fits the context better than the indicative, but the indicative with sarcastic force is possible. Coincidence of word accent and verse ictus favors *meminē′runt* over *meminerint*, since quadrisyllabic perfect forms beginning with three short syllables are usually accented on the first syllable (§41. a).

23 : Ba. 370 nísì quem spés RELÍQUĒR*e* ómnes éss*e* ut frúgi póssiét.

24 : Ba. 610 sed húc concédam, nám CONCRÉPUĒRÚNT forés.

25 : Ba. 668 núm qui númm*i* ÉXCIDĒ′RUNT, ére, tibí, [6]

26 : Ba. 928 millí cum número náviúm decum*o* ánno póst SUBÉGĔRÚNT.

27 : Ba. 936 non súnt tabéllae, séd equos quém MISĒ′R*e* Achívi lígneúm.

28 : Ba. 1087 quiquómqu*e* ubĭ súnt, qui fū′ĒRÚNT [7] quiqué futurí sunt pósthac (Anap.)

29 : Ba. 1135 EXSÓLUĒ′RE quántí fuē′r*e*, ómni' frúctús (Bacch.)

30 : Ba. 1135 exsóluē′re quántí FUĒ′R*e*, ómni' frúctús (Bacch.)

31 : Ba. 1183 quădrigéntis [8] Phílĭppis fíliu' m*e* ét Chrysálu' CIRCÚMDUXĒ′RUNT. (Anap.)

32 : Ba. 1206 lepid*e* íps*i* hi súnt captí, suĭs quí fílĭis FECĒ′R*e* insídias. (Anap.)

33 : Cap. 7 sen*i* húic FUĒ′RUNT fílií natí duó ;

34 : Cap. 35 hisc*e* áut*em* intér ses*e* húnc CONFÍNXĒRÚNT dolúm,

35 : Cap. 47 ita CÓMPARĀ′RUNT ét confínxērúnt dolúm

36 : Cap. 47 ita cómparā′runt ét CONFÍNXĒRÚNT dolúm

37 : Cap. 86 sumu' : quándo rés REDIĒ′RUNT [9], <túm> Molóssicí

6. Two cretics and two iambs ; or, two cretics followed by ⏑́ || ⏑́⏑⏑⏑́. Lindsay, according to ELV 293-5, would call this verse a miuric form of the curtailed cretic tetrameter. The curtailed cretic tetrameter consists of two cretics followed by ⏑́⏓ | ⏑́⏑⏑́ ; the miuric form has a 'short for the first long syllable of the final foot (⏑⏑⏑̣-)'. In a number of Lindsay's examples, I cannot see anything except combinations of cretic with iambic or trochaic feet : *me ire minime* Mo. 693, *est ut abeam* Mo. 706, should certainly be scanned ⏑́⏑ | ⏑́⏑- ; *sic sine, Simo* Ps. 1301 (similar to the end of the verse which is under discussion here) should be scanned -⏑́⏑ | ⏑⏑́, or perhaps ⏑́ || ⏑́⏑⏑⏑́. Cf. §40. a.

7. Ital. (apud Lindsay) *ubi ubi*, which is adopted by Leo and by Goetz, requires the scansion *fŭĕrunt*. B has *ubique*, probably an error in copying caused by the preceding *quiquomque*, and not for *ubiqu'*, as Lindsay suggests. The only apparent reason for changing to *ubi ubi* is objection to long *u* in *fūērunt*, but *fū-* occurs elsewhere in Plautus : *fūit* Cap. 555, *fūerim* Mi. 1364, *fūerint* Po. 110. There is no other possible instance of *fŭĕrunt* in Plautus (§39). I follow Lindsay in the reading adopted.

8. The first syllable of *quadrigenti* is regularly short in Plautus : Lindsay ELV 77.

9. Mss. *canes sumus quando res redierunt Molossici*. *Canes* (rejected by most editors) undoubtedly started as a gloss with *venatici* at the end of the preceding verse. Redslob (apud Lindsay) emended to *rediere tum* ; Schoell, independently, to *rediere* (or *redierunt*) *tum*. The emendation to the unusual ending *-ēre* seems unwise. The monosyllable *tum* might readily have been lost in copying, perhaps from a manuscript which had *redieṝtummolossici*. The ending *-erunt* may be represented in manuscripts

38 : Cap. 195 si d*i* ínmortáles íd VOLUĒ'RUNT [10], vós hanc áerumn*am* éxsequí,
39 : Cap. 242 quóniam nóbis d*i* ínmortáles ánim*um* OSTÉNDĒRÚNT suóm,
40 : Cap. 415 mérito tíbĭ | e*a* ÉVENĒ'RUNT á me ; nám nunc, Phílocratés,
41 : Cap. 493 quí consíl*ium* INIĒ'RE, quó nos víct*u* et víta próhibeánt,
42 : Cap. 502-3 ita mé miserúm || réstitándo rétinendóque lássum RÉDDIDĒ'RUNT : [11]
43 : Cap. 524 opérta quáe FUĒ'R*e* apérta súnt, patĕnt práestigi*ae*, ómnis rés palám *e*st,
44 : Cap. 653 sátĭn med íll*i* hodié scelésti cápti CÉPĒRÚNT doló ?
45 : Cap. 656 íta mihĭ stólido súsum vórs*um* os SÚBLEVĒ'R*e* offúciís.
46 : Cap. 824 mírumqu*e* ádeost ni húnc FECĒ'RE síbĭ | Aetól*i* [12] agoránomúm.
47 : Cap. 923 quom té rédducém túŏ patrí RÉDDIDĒ'RÚNT (Bacch.)
48 : Cap. 924 quomqu*e* éx míseriís plúrumís m*e* ÉXEMĒ'RÚNT, (Bacch.)
49 : Cas. 15 nam júniórum quí sunt nón NŌRÚNT, sció ;
50 : Cas. 19 qui núnc ABIĒ'RUNT hínc in cómmuném locúm.
51 : Cas. 70 nov*om* ÁTTULĒ'RUNT, quód fit núsquam géntiúm.

either by *-er̃* or by *-er̃t* as well as by the complete form. Lindsay and others read *sumús quandó res rédiĕrúnt Molóssici* ; this reading is possible, but I prefer to adopt *tum* in order to secure better coincidence of word accent and verse ictus.

10. Schoell reads *uoluēre* (*uoluērunt*, Goetz and Schoell [1914]) on the basis of a fifteenth-century manuscript (F) ; this form in *-ēre* was probably caused by an error of judgment in copying a manuscript which had *uoluer̃*, the reading of B in this nstance.

11. This verse starts in anapaestic meter, as do lines 498 and 500 preceding, which are anapaestic tetrameters. But here (502-3), after the first two feet, the poet substitutes a slow trochaic rhythm to suit the context. The pronunciation of the actor probably suggested the delays and struggles which he had encountered, and his weariness. It is possible to scan the first two feet as trochaics also ; but the length of the verse, the alternation between anapaestic and bacchiac meters in the immediately preceding lines, and the fact that two pure anapaests are possible, seem to favor the scansion which I have adopted. Lindsay and Schoell both read the verse as a trochaic octonarius : Lindsay by rejecting *que* and scanning *reddidĕrunt* (cf. §40. a) ; Schoell by rejecting *que* and changing *lassum* to *assum*, which does not fit the context at all. Goetz and Schoell (1914) abandon the scansion of the verse.

12. Havet, believing that *-ēre* was used by Plautus only for metrical reasons, questions the authenticity of this verse (§13). The form *fecēre* (B) is doubtless correct (cf. §18. b).

52 : Cas. 289 át tu*a* úxor fíliúsque PRÓMISĒ'RUNT míhĭ. sció.
53 : Cas. 417 víctus és, Chalíne. quóm nos dí JUVĒ'R*e*, Olýmpió,
54 : Cas. 687 er*a* átque háec dol*um* éx próxum*o* húnc PRÓTULĒ'RÚNT, (Bacch.)
55 : Cas. 721 quia quód TETIGĒ'R*e*, ilícŏ rapiúnt, sĭ | eás erépt*um*, ilícŏ scindúnt : (Anap.)
56 : Cas. 936 séd CONCRÉPUĒRÚNT forés. N*um* ĭlla mé nunc séquitur ? [13]
57 : Ci. 156 FUĒ'RE Sícyoní jam díŭ Dionýsiá.
58 : Ci. 381 (frag.) MÉMINĒR*e* ófficiúm suóm.
59 : Cu. 293 úbĭ quid SÚRRUPUĒ'R*e* : opérto cápituló calidúm bibúnt,
60 : Cu. 451 ita nón POTUĒ'R*e* un*o* ánno círcumíriér.
61 : Cu. 486 séd ĭnterím forés CREPUĒ'RE : línguae móderandúm *e*st mihí.
62 : Cu. 685 vér*um* amíci CÓMPULĒ'RUNT : réddit árgentúm domó.
63 : Ep. 30 pól ĭll*a* ad hóstis TRÁNSFUGĒ'RUNT. árman*e* ? átque quidém citó.
64 : Ep. 32 édepol fácinus ínprob*um* ! át j*am* ant*e* álii FÉCĒRÚNT idém.
65 : Ep. 35 TRÁVOLÁVĔRÚNT [14] ad hóstis. t*um* ílle prógnatús Thetí
66 : Ep. 236 quín t*u* ut óccepísti lóquer*e* ? OCCÉPĒR*e* áliae múlierés
67 : Ep. 340 credé modo míhĭ : sic ég*o* ago, síc EGĒ'RUNT nóstri. [15]

13. Three and a half trochees followed by two and a half iambs, or more technically, a glyconic followed by a colon Reizianum ; or perhaps merely six trochees. Lindsay calls the second half of this verse a dochmius, scanning -◡◡-◡◡-. The chief difficulty lies in the scansion of *illa*. The first syllable of pronouns such as *iste* and *ille*, is frequently shortened on the iambic principle when a short vowel precedes. I consider it entirely possible that this happened so frequently that the first syllable of these pronouns was occasionally pronounced in the same way when unaccented and not preceded by a short vowel, in spite of Lindsay ELV 164 ; the influence of analogy in colloquial language cannot be disregarded. For that reason, I prefer to scan *illa* as a pyrrhic (◡◡) ; it is thus possible to scan this verse in exactly the same way as the two preceding verses (lines 634-5). The scansion of this verse is abandoned by Goetz and Schoell (1914).

So far as the perfect form is concerned, I believe that the first half of the verse must have been pronounced in exactly the same way as *nám concrépuērúnt forés* 24, at the end of a verse (§41. b).

14. Cf. §35.

15. The scansion of this verse is not certain, but there can be no doubt about the perfect form. This and the preceding line seem to me to consist of six and a half iambs (lines 337-8 and 341-81 are iambic septenarii). Lindsay suggests that it may be a versus Priapeus (ELV 305). Goetz and Schoell (1901) do not attempt to scan the first part.

68 : Ep. 474 ei qu*ae* ÁCCESSĒ´RE, tíb*i* ăddam dóno grátiís.

69 : Ep. 613 núnc hominés me quáeritáre crédo. SÉNSĒRÚNT, sciúnt

70 : Ep. 670 lássitúdin*e* ÍNVASĒ´RUNT míser*o* in génua fléminá.

71 : Men. 67 illí divítiae | ÉVENĒ´RUNT máxumáe.

72 : Men. 206 quáttuór mináe PERIĒ´RUNT plán*e*, ut rátio rédditúr.

73 : Men. 343 si PÉLLEXĒ´RUNT, pérdit*um* ámittúnt domúm.

74 : Men. 586 quíppe quí prŏ | íllis lóquimur quáe malĕ FÉCĔRÚNT : [16]

75 : Men. 758 RELÍQUĒ´R*e* : ut áetás malá *e*st ! mérs mal*a* érgóst. (Bacch.)

76 : Men. 876 jamn*e* íst*i* ABIĒ´RUNT, quáes*o*, ex cónspectú meó,

77 : Men. 1151 quóni*am* haec ÉVENĒ´RE [17], fráter, nóstra | éx senténtiá, [18]

78 : Mer. 318 FECĒ´RE tál*e* ant*e* áliei spéctatéi viréi.

79 : Mer. 541 n*am* illí quid*em* háu sané diúst quom déntes ÉXCIDĒ´RUNT.

80 : Mer. 718 quid áut*em* urbáni DÉLIQUĒ´RUNT ? díc mihí,

81 : Mer. 752 JUSSĒ´RUNT férri, quós intér judéx datú's ?

82 : Mi. 60 me RÉPREHENDĒ´RUNT. quíd <eae> díxērúnt tibí ?

83 : Mi. 60 me réprehendē´runt. quíd <eae> DÍXĒRÚNT tibí ?

84 : Mi. 270 séd forés CREPUĒ´RUNT nóstr*ae* [19], egŏ vóci móderabór meáe ;

85 : Mi. 328 séd forĕs CÓNCREPUĒ´RUNT nóstr*ae*. [20] at eg*o* ílic*o* ópservó forés ;

86 : Mi. 410 séd forés vicíni próxumí CREPUĒ´RUNT. cónticíscam.

16. This verse is rejected or questioned as an interpolation by most editors. It does not seem to be essential to the sense, and the scansion of the entire passage is difficult. Ms. A has *fecerunt*, P *fecerint*. Only the indicative seems reasonably possible, and I follow Lindsay in adopting *fecerunt*. But Lindsay considers the verse a combination of a glyconic and a dochmius, with *fecĕrunt*. I prefer to scan this and the preceding line as catalectic trochaic verses.

17. A *euenere*, P *euenerunt* ; cf. §18. f.

18. Probably *nostrad ex sententiad* ; cf. §18. f.

19. A B *crepuerunt*, C D *concrepuerunt* ; cf. note 20.

20. Mss. (BCD) *concrepuerunt*. Lindemann's emendation (apud Goetz) is followed by Goetz who cites Abraham, Studia Plautina 200-1 (1884). Abraham noticed that the manuscript evidence on *crepuerunt* and *concrepuerunt* is quite confusing, and since C and D have a metrically impossible *concrepuerunt* for *crepuerunt* in No. 86 (cf. also note 19), believed that an emendation to *crepuerunt* was justified here (85). Since neither reading has any influence on the perfect form (I should scan *fores* as an iamb before *crepuērunt*, as in No. 84), I follow the manuscripts and Lindsay.

87 : Mi. 590 TRANSFÚGĒR*e* ád nos. úsqu*e* adhúc actúm *e*st probé;
88 : Mi. 604 quíppe <quí>, si RÉSCIVĒ′R*e*[21] inimíci cónsiliúm tuóm,
89 : Mi. 753 n*am* í solént, quand*o* ÁCCUBUĒ′R*e*, ubĭ cén*a* adpósitast, díceré :
90 : Mi. 883 postqu*am* ÁDBIBĒ′R*e* aurés meáe tu*am* ór*am* orátiónis,[22]
91 : Mi. 914 quid ístis núnc memorátis ópŭst quae CÓMMEMINĒ′RE? méliust.
92 : Mi. 1090 † hic cúm | era *e*st, clám nostr*um* húnc † sermónem SÚBLEGĒ′RUNT. (Anap.)
93 : Mi. 1271 dum t*e* óptuétur, ínterím lingu*am* óculi PRÁECIDĒ′RUNT.
94 : Mi. 1316 tíbĭ salútem mé JUSSĒ′RUNT díceré. | salváe siént.
95 : Mi. 1377 ád amorés meós. sed, séns*i*, hinc sónitum FÉCĒRÚNT forés.
96 : Mi. 1392 mulíer*em*[23] : ODĒ′RUNT quá virí qua múlierés.
97 : Mi. 1432 nám postquám port*a* ÉXIĒ′RUNT, níhĭl cessā′runt ílicó
98 : Mi. 1432 nám postquám port*a* éxiē′runt, níhĭl CESSĀ′RUNT ílicó
99 : Mo. 80 PERIĒ′R*e*, et áedes ét ager ; quí nis*i* húc redít,
100 : Mo. 115 mór*em* hunc ÍNDUXĒ′RUNT : sí quid númmo sárcirí potést,
101 : Mo. 145 DÉSERUĒ′RUNT[24] : égŏ s*um* in úsu fáctus nímio néquiór.

21. BCD *quippe scire siuere ; quippe hi si resciuere* probable reading of A ; *quippe qui* Tyrrell (adn. ad Mi. 604), whose emendation is followed by Lindsay.

22. Mss. *tuam moram.* Various emendations have been suggested, but I prefer Lindsay's reading to any other. It seems to me that there is a word play between *adbibēre* and *oram*, the 'edge' or 'lip' of a cup (Lucret. 4.13 *oras pocula circum*). The verse is certainly in mock-heroic style (§19).

23. B *mulierem, mulieres eum* CD, *mulier : eum* Camerarius, *quem omnes* Guyet (ap. Goetz), followed by Tyrrell. Lindsay follows Camerarius. The meaning seems to be sufficiently clear without *eum* or *quem* as the object of *oderunt*. *Eum* would require the scansion *ódĕrúnt*, either a rare perfect in *-ĕrunt*, or conflict of accent and ictus. I believe that *mulierem* is the correct reading, and that this word is to be associated with *quemque* in the preceding verse. Tyrrell pointed out that the reading *queque* B (*quemque* CD) may represent *quemque* rather than *quaeque* as it is taken by Ritschl, Lindsay, and others. *Quemque,* according to Tyrrell, is equivalent to *quamcunque*. *Quisque* (and *quis* also) is used as a feminine form in Old Latin : Po. 107, Hec. 216. *Quamque* is rare in Plautus : Po. 106, Tru. 252, Vi. 114 (according to G. Lodge, Lexicon Plautinum, 2.516 ; Leipzig, 1930). *Quemquam* is used as a feminine adjective in Old Latin (Lane-Morgan §692). Thus it seems probable that *quemque* in Mi. 1391 is an adjective modifying *mulierem* in the following verse. This interpretation makes possible the reading which I have adopted for Mi. 1392.

24. See §42.

102 : Mo. 165 madént *jam* in córde párietés, PERIĒ'R*e* haec óppid*o* áedes.

103 : Mo. 281 quíbus anús domĭ súnt uxóres, quáe vos dóte MÉRUĔRÚNT.

104 : Mo. 732 núnc nobís <ómni*a*> háec ÉXCIDĒ'RÚNT [25], <Simó>. (Cret.)

105 : Mo. 735 PRÓCESSĒ'RÚNT. it*a* út dícis fáct*a* háu negó. (Cret.)

106 : Pe. 58 quasĭ múres sémper ÉDĒR*e* álienúm cibúm,

107 : Pe. 160 dare débet : práebend*a* áedilés LOCÁVĔRÚNT.

108 : Pe. 506 Chrysópolim Pérsae CÉPĒR*e* úrb*em* in Árabiá,

109 : Pe. 777 qui súnt quĭ | erúnt quiqué FUĒRÚNT quiqué futurí sunt pósthac, (Anap.)

110 : Po. 21 diŭ quí dom*i* ótiósi DÓRMĪRÚNT [26], decét

111 : Po. 60 FUĒ'RE súmmo génere et súmmis dítiís ;

112 : Po. 84 Cartháginiénsi dúăe FUĒ'RE fíliáe,

113 : Po. 86 cum nútric*e* úna PÉRIĒR*e* á Magáribús.

114 : Po. 223 eáe nós lavánd*o*, éluéndó || operám DEDĒ'RUNT, [27]

115 : Po. 476 FUĒ'RE. vér*um* eg*o* ínterféci. quó modó

116 : Po. 609 tácĕ. quid ést ? forĕs háe FECĒ'RUNT mágnum flágitiúm modó.

25. Mss. *communia*, Lindsay *comia* ; E. A. Sonnenschein (adn. ad loc. : Mos--ellaria ; 2d ed. ; Oxford, 1907) objects to *comia*, on the ground that *comis* is used only of persons in Plautus. *Communia* is metrically impossible. I have followed Sonnenschein in adopting *omnia*, the emendation of Camerarius. It is possible that *-cum* was unconsciously added to *nobis* in copying, and that *nobiscum omnia* was later changed to *nobis communia*.

26. The manuscript reading *dormierunt* (i.e., *-ĭĕrunt*) has been followed by editors, though the authenticity of this prologue is questioned (Sommer 567). Leo, adn. ad loc., remarks that perfects with short *-e-* are not found elsewhere except at the end of a verse or colon. This fact alone is not sufficient reason to reject the form *dormĭĕrunt* ; cf. *travolāvĕrunt* 65, §35. The following readings suggest the plausibility of a manuscript change from an unusual form in *-īrunt* (perhaps strange to the copyist) : *desierint* B, *deserint* CD, in Mer. 613 for *di sirint* ; *siritis* A, *repperirem esiritis* CD, *reperiremesiritis* B, for *reperire me siritis* Po. 853. Presumably the copyists of BCD did not recognize the forms *siritis* and *sirint* at all. Cf. §36. b.

27. Three bacchiacs followed by two and a half iambs. Lindsay and others scan this verse as a bacchiac tetrameter with *dédĕrúnt* (cf. §40. a). A pause after *lavando eluendo* does not seem unnatural, since *lavando et fricando* occurs at the end of a verse in the same passage, line 231. *Operam* before a form of the verb *do*, frequently has the ictus on the final syllable : *operam date*, etc., at verse ends in Po. 58, 512, 545, 589, 785. The following verse (Po. 224) can be scanned only with three cretics followed by two and a half iambs, and the second half of Po. 223 as scanned by me above, is therefore similar to the second half of Po. 224.

117 : Po. 610 quíd <id> est flágití ? CREPUĒ'RUNT cláre. dí te pérduínt!
118 : Po. 612 fáciunt scúrrae quód CONSVĒ'RUNT : póne sés*e* hominés locánt.
119 : Po. 689 it*a* ĭllí DIXĒ'RUNT qu*ei* hínc a m*e* ábiērúnt modó,
120 : Po. 689 it*a* ĭllí dixē'runt qu*ei* hínc a m*e* ÁBIĒRÚNT modó,
121 : Po. 741 tacéndi témpus ést, nam CRÉPUĒRÚNT forés.
122 : Po. 769 hi qu*i* íllum dúdum CÓNCILIÁVĒRÚNT mihí
123 : Po. 772 nunc húnc inimícum quí*a* ĕsse SCÍVĒRÚNT mihí,
124 : Po. 773 e*um* ÁDLEGĀ'RUNT[28] súŏm qui sérvom dícerét
125 : Po. 850 Vénerem PLÁCAVĒ'R*e* extémpl*o*. o lépidam Vénerem dénuó!
126 : Po. 970 ut m*i* ÁPSTERSĒ'RUNT ómnem sórtitúdiném!
127 : Po. 989 PERIĒ'RE púeri líberí Cartháginé.
128 : Po. 1134 orát*um* IĒ'RUNT dé*am* ŭt sib*i* ésset própitiá.
129 : Po. 1135 pol sáti' sci*o*, ÍMPETRĀ'RUNT, quánd*o* hic híc adést.
130 : Po. 1376 tetigít ? nunc périi ! | únd*e* haec PÉRIĒRÚNT domó ?
131 : Po. 1380 PERIĒ'R*e*, opínor, dúŏdevígintí mináe,
132 : Po. 1386 ver*um* étiam fúrac*em* <áiunt> quí NŌRÚNT mágis.[29]
133 : Ps. 200 DÉVINXĒ'R*e* ad táur*um*, it*em* égŏ te dístring*am* ád carnárium;
134 : Ps. 539 quid s*i* hísc*e* intér se CÓNSENSĒ'RUNT, Cálliphó,
135 : Ps. 721 hí sciúnt qu*i* hic ÁDFUĒ'RUNT; vóbis póst narráveró.
136 : Ps. 818 priu' quám TRIVĒ'RUNT óculi ut éxstillént facít.
137 : Ps. 905 s*i* umquám quemquám d*i* inmórtalés VOLUĒ'R*e* ess*e*[30] áuxili*o* ádjutúm, (Anap.)
138 : Ps. 907 quom t*e* ádjutórem GÉNUĒRÚNT mihĭ tám doct*um* hóminem atqu*e* ástutúm. (Anap.)
139 : Ps. 1106 ex cónspéct*u* erí sí suí s*e* ÁBDIDĒ'RÚNT, (Bacch.)
140 : Ru. 75 de návi tímidae DÉSULUĒ'RUNT[31] ín scaphám.
141 : Ru. 151 qui ? quía post cénam, crédo, LÁVĒRÚNT herí.
142 : Ru. 168 salváe sunt s*i* íllos flúctus DÉVITÁVĔRÚNT.[32]

28. A *eum adlegarunt, eum adlegauerunt* P. Lindsay suggests *adlegauerunt* (Pylades) as a possibility (omitting *eum*), but the change is not necessary.

29. Pylades *nouerunt*, *aiunt* Brix. I prefer to adopt the emendation of Brix, rather than *novērunt*, because of *nōrunt*, *scio* 49.

30. A *uolerunt*. The scribe was probably influenced by *genuerunt* of the second line following. Similarly, in the verse preceding *suspendēre* No. 164, A has a metrically impossible *abiere* for *abiērunt* No. 163 (Havet, Rev. Phil. 31.230).

31. See §42.

32. Ms.. *deuitauerunt*, Pylades *deuitauerint*. Lindsay adopts *deuitauerint*; Schoell

143 : Ru. 219 neque quícqu*am* umqu*am* íllis prófuít qui mé sib*i* ÉDUXĒ′RUNT.

144 : Ru. 291 praesértim quíbu' nec quáestus ést nec DÍDICĒR*e*[33] ártem | úllam :

145 : Ru. 358 ea núnc PERIĒ′RUNT ómni*a*. óh, Neptúne lépide, sálve!

146 : Ru. 625 mór*e* antíqu*o* in cústodélam súŏm COMMÍSĒRÚNT capút,

147 : Ru. 697 illós sceléstos quí tuóm FECĒ′RUNT fánum párvi

148 : Ru. 727 *si* áutem Véneri CÓMPLACUĒ′RUNT[34], hábeat, *si* árgentúm dabít.

149 : Ru. 1207 Láribus fámiliáribús, qu*om* AUXĒ′RUNT nóstram fámiliám.

150 : Ru. 1313 numm*i* óctingéntĭ | áure*i* ín marsúppi*o* ÍNFUĒ′RUNT,

151 : Ru. 1359 ómni*a*, ŭt quídquid[35] ÍNFUĒ′R*e*, ita sálva sístentúr tibí.

152 : St. 35 nam vírĭ nostrí dom*o* ut ÁBIĒRÚNT (Anap.)

153 : St. 101 éŏs nos mágnuficáre quí nos sócias SÚMPSĒRÚNT sibí.

154 : St. 137 quíd ĭllos éxspectátis quĭ′ | abhinc j*am* ÁBIĒRÚNT[36] triénniúm ?

155 : St. 188 nunc RÉPPERĒ′RUNT j*am* éi verbó vicáriúm

156 : St. 209 damn*a* ÉVENĒ′RUNT máxumá | miseró mihí,

157 : St. 210 ita mé mancúpia míser*um* ADFÉCĒRÚNT malé,

158 : St. 332 Pínaci*um*. ístuc ÍNDIDĒ′RUNT nómen máiorés mihí.

159 : St. 581 íta m*i* auctóres FVĒ′R*e*, ut égŏmet m*e* hódie[37] júgularém — famé.

reads *deuitauerunt* in the large edition, but *-erint* is adopted by Goetz and Schoell (1913). A perfect indicative is used for a future perfect in Mo. 827 *boni sunt, si inducti sunt pice* (cf. Bennett, Syntax of Early Latin 1.46; Boston, 1910). Sommer 583 (and Lindsay, adn. ad loc.) considers it possible that the manuscript reading may represent an old future perfect form in *-erunt*, but the evidence given by Sommer for the existence of such a future perfect form within historical times is extremely meager. In my opinion, *devitavĕrunt* should be taken either as a perfect indicative or as an error in writing for *devitaverint*.

33. Mss. *nec*, *edidicere* Marx (apud Lindsay), *neque* Lindsay. The meaning of *edidicēre* does not fit the context, and with a choice between the scansion *nequé didicē′re* and hiatus after *artem*, I prefer the latter.

34. See §42.

35. Schoell *infuit*, Reiz (apud Lindsay) *quicque*; Lindsay considers the reading doubtful. Sonnenschein (adn. ad loc. : Rudens ; Oxford, 1901) reads *quidque*. But since *quidquid* is sometimes used for *quidque* (Lane-Morgan §2398), I believe that *quidquid* with distributive force could also take a plural verb, and therefore prefer to follow the manuscript reading.

36. See §41. c.

37. Mss. *mihi*. A number of emendations have been suggested presumably to

160 : St. 632 jámn*e* ABIĒ'RUNT ? Gélasimé, | vidĕ, núnc consílio cápt*o* opúst.

161 : St. 636 vidén ? benígnitátes hóminum PÉRIĒR*e*[38] ét prothýmiáe.

162 : Tri. 31 quas*i* hérb*a* inrígua SÚCCREVĒ'R*e*[39] ubérrumé;

163 : Tri. 535 ali*i* éxsulát*um* ABIĒ'RUNT, áli*i* emórtuí,

164 : Tri. 536 alii se SÚSPENDĒ'R*e*. em núnc hic quóius ést

165 : Tri. 625 háud inéuschem*e* ÁSTITĒ'RUNT. húc aliquánt*um* apscésseró :

166 : Tri. 642 ítăn tand*em* hánc maióres fámam TRÁDIDĒ'RUNT tíbĭ tuí,

167 : Tri. 1037 móres léges PÉRDUXĒ'RUNT j*am* ín potéstatém suám,

168 : Tru. 101 consúlta súnt consília : quánd*o* intr*o* ÁDVENĒ'RUNT,

169 : Tru. 221 VORTĒ'RUNT sése mémoriáe ; stultús sit qu*i* íd mirétur.

170 : Tru. 285 núllan ístic múlier hábitat ? rús, inqu*am*, ÁBIĒRÚNT. abi.

171 : Tru. 301 úbĭ res PÉRDIDĒ'R*e*[40], abír*e* hinc sí volúnt salvís licét.

172 : Tru. 468 nímí' quam páucae súnt deféssae málĕ quae fácer*e* OCCÉPĔRÚNT, [41]

173 : Tru. 469 nímí'que páuc*ae* ecfíciunt sí quid fácer*e* OCCÉPĒRÚNT bené : [42]

avoid the scansion *fvēre*; the fact that a similar scansion is required for the same phrase in 208 t, and for a similar phrase in 189 t, leads me to believe that the reading of Lindsay is correct. Cf. §26.

38. P *periere*. Apud Lindsay, '*ut perierint* A[1] (ut del. A[2]) unde *ut periere* edd.' It appears to me that the reading in the palimpsest must have been influenced by *viden* at the beginning of the verse; that is, an indirect question in the subjunctive was considered necessary. *Perierint* would violate the usual accent of words of this type (§41.a).

39. A *succreuere*; BCD *succreuerunt*, perhaps for *succrērunt*.

40. A *res perdidere*, *perdiderunt res* P (i.e., *-ĕrunt*). The latter reading may have been influenced by a similar phrase at the end of a hexameter verse. Horace, for instance, frequently has verses ending in the monosyllable *res* : Ars Poetica 40, 148, 248; cf. Sat. 2.2.106 *sémpĕr ĕrúnt res*. Manuscripts of the Palatine group sometimes have *-erunt* where A has *-ere* (as in 77, 162); after the change to *-erunt*, the order of the words might have been changed in this instance. The perfect ending *-ĕrunt* preceded by a short vowel may not have existed at the time of Plautus (§62).

41. CD *occeperent* (apud Lindsay, 'i.e. *rint*?'). B omits this verse entirely, probably because of the similarity of the first few words of this and the following verse (468-9). The ending *-erent* for *-erunt* may have started as a mere error in writing. I do not know how Lindsay would explain the syntax of *occeperint*.

42. Mss. *occeperunt bene facere*, the scansion of which is impossible. A scribe probably changed the true reading to bring *bene* and *facere* together as one word. Bothe (apud Lindsay) corrected the order.

174 : Tru. 532 suáe FUĒ'R*e* ambáe, ver*um* <eárum>[43] pátri*am* eg*o* éxcidí manú.

175 : Vid. 17 (frag. 1) éiusdém Baccháe FECĒ'RUNT nóstram návem Péntheúm.

§10. The Occurrences in Terence:

176 t : An. 13 quae CÓNVENĒ'R*e* in Ándri*am* éx Perínthiá

177 t : An. 81 PERDÚXĒR*e* ílluc, séc*um* ut ún*a* essét, meúm.

178 t : An. 219 quidquíd peperísset DÉCREVĒ'RUNT tólleré.

179 t : An. 534 aliquód m*e* ADIĒ'RUNT, éx t*e* audítum qu*i* áibant hódie núberé

180 t : An. 740 revórtor, póstquam qu*ae* ópŭs FUĒ'R*e* ad núptiás

181 t : An. 771 qu*om* in páriund*o* áliquod ÁDFUĒ'RUNT líberáe.

182 t : An. 799 eius mórt*e* e*a* ád me lége RÉDIĒRÚNT boná.

183 t : An. 810 qu*ae* illíus FUĒ'RUNT póssidét[44]: nunc m*e* hóspitém

184 t : Hea. 16 nam quód rumóres DÍSTULĒ'RUNT málivolí,

185 t : Hea. 21 licér*e* id fácere quód ĭlli FÉCĒRÚNT putát.

186 t : Hea. 121 ubĭ cómper*i* éx eis quí FUĒ'R*e* ei cónscií,

187 t : Hea. 173 ib*o* áde*o* hinc íntro. séd quid CRÉPUĒRÚNT forés

188 t : Hea. 248 áurum, vést*em*; et vésperáscit ét non NÓVĒRÚNT viám.

189 t : Hea. 399 nam d*um* ábs t*e* abs*um* ómnes míhĭ labóres FVĒ'RE quós cepí levés,

190 t : Hea. 500 me CÉPĒR*e* árbitr*um* : íb*o* ac díc*am*, ut díxerám

191 t : Hea. 613 mánĕ, mané quid ĕst quód t*am* a nóbis gráviter CRÉPUĒRÚNT forés?

192 t : Hea. 723 satĭs pól protérve mé Syrí promíss*a* huc ÍNDUXĒ'RUNT,

193 t : Hea. 745 qu*am* ob rém? ne quáeras: écferánt quae séc*um* huc ÁTTULĒ'RUNT.

194 t : Hea. 886 háhahae. quíd risísti? sérvi VÉNĒR*e* ín mentém Syrí

195 t : Hea. 906 sóla? sóla. péri*i*. ub*i* ÁBIĒR*e* íntr*o*, opéruēr*e* ósti*um*. hém,

196 t : Hea. 906 sóla? sóla. péri*i*. ub*i* ábiēr*e* íntr*o*, OPÉRUĒR*e* ósti*um*. hém,

197 t : Hea. 916 quod rés DEDĒ'R*e*, ubĭ póssem pérsentísceré,

43. Apud Lindsay: Bothe *fuerunt*, Seyffert *earum*. I prefer to adopt the emendation which does not affect the perfect form.

44. *Illius* is here a dissyllable; cf. Lindsay ELV 64-5, and monosyllabic *eius* in the preceding example (182 t).

198t : Eu. 20 Menándr*i* Eunúchum, póstqu*am* aedíles ÉMĔRÚNT,
199t : Eu. 43 quae véteres FÁCTITĀ′RUNT sí faciúnt noví.
200t : Eu. 544 nunc m*i* hóc negóti céterí DEDĒ′R*e* ut íllum quáeram
201t : Eu. 593 iït, lávit, rédiit; déind*e* e*am* ín lect*o* íllae CÓNLOCĀ′-RUNT.
202t : Eu. 702 me*am* ĭpse índuít : post ún*a* amb*o* ÁBIĒRÚNT forás.
203t : Eu. 993 COMPRÉNDĒR*e* íntus ét constrínxēr*e*. óccidí.
204t : Eu. 993 compréndēr*e* íntus ét CONSTRÍNXĒR*e*. óccidí.
205t : Eu. 1029 séd forés CREPUĒ′RUNT áb ea. périi : quíd hŏc autémst malí?
206t : Eu. 1033 omn*ém* ÓSTENDĒ′RE quói tam súbito tót congrúerint cómmodá.
207t : Ph. 77 VENĒ′R*e* in méntem m*i* ístaec : námqu*e* inscítiást,
208t : Ph. 625 un*o* ór*e* auctóres FVĒ′R*e*[45] ut práecipit*em* hánc darét.
209t : Ph. 676 n*am* illí mihĭ dótem jám CONSTÍTUĒRÚNT daré.
210t . Ph. 705 quod rés postílla mónstr*a* EVÉNĒRÚNT mihí !
211t : Ph. 895 quand*o* ÉVENĒ′R*e* haec nóbis, fráter, prósperé.
212t : Hec. 36 FECĒ′R*e* ut ánte témpus éxirém forás.
213t : Hec. 186 DIXĒ′RE cáusam nésciŏ quám t*um*. iterúm jubét :
214t : Hec. 201 itaqu*e* áde*o* un*o* ánim*o* omnés socrús ODĒ′RUNT, <ódērúnt> nurús.
215t : Hec. 201 itaqu*e* áde*o* un*o* ánim*o* omnés socrús odē′runt, <ÓDĒRÚNT> nurús.[46]
216t : Hec. 212 qu*i* illúm DECRĒ′RUNT dígnum súŏs quoi líberós commítterént.
217t : Hec. 242 úbĭ DUXĒ′R*e* inpúlsu vóstro, vóstr*o* inpúls*u* eăsd*em* éxigúnt.
218t : Hec. 277 séd non fácilest éxpurgát*u* : it*a* ánim*um* INDÚXĒRÚNT socrús
219t : Hec. 321 pavitáre nésciŏ quíd DIXĒ′RUNT : íd si fórte *e*st nésció.
220t : Hec. 367 póstquam m*e* ÁSPEXĒ′R*e* ancíll*ae*, advéniss*e* ómnes ílicó
221t : Ad. 93 DIXĒ′R*e* ! in órest ómni pópulo. déniqué,
222t : Ad. 227 nusquám pedém. perí*i* hércl*e* : hac ílli sp*e* hóc INCÉ-PĒRÚNT. timét :
223t : Ad. 595 sibĭ fíer*i* injúri*am* últro, sí quam FÉCĒR*e* íps*i* expós-tulés.

45. Cf. note 37.
46. Umpfenbach (apud Tyrrell) suggested that *oderunt* should be repeated.

224t : Ad. 649 neq*ue* ením di*u* húc MIGRĀ́RUNT. quíd tum pósteá?
225t : Ad. 688 FÉCĒR*e* álii sáep*e* itém bon*i*. ăt póstqu*am* id évenít, cedó
226t : Ad. 691 quá rescíscer*em*? háec dum dúbitas, ménses ÁBIĒRÚNT decém.
227t : Ad. 743 pro psáltriá PERIḖRE : quáe quantúm potést
228t : Ad. 815 mea, quáe praetér sp*em* EVÉNĒR*e*, útantúr siné.

§11. Though some editors have adopted third plural perfect forms in the following verses, I find it difficult to accept perfects in each instance, for reasons given in the notes. These two verses will not be mentioned later:

229 : Mi. 1327 formam huius, morem, virtus, hic animum attinere hic tuom,[47]
230t : An. 931 mult*i* áli*i* in Ándro t*um* áudir*e*. útin*am* id sít quod spér*o*! eho, díc mihí,[48]

The readings *obsecraverunt* Mi. 66 and *voluerunt* Mi. 117 which are listed by Neue-Wagener (Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache 3^3. 199; Berlin, 1897) are merely emendations which have not commended themselves to recent editors.

47. The manuscript reading is given above. Though many emendations have been suggested, it is difficult to decide whether any approaches the Plautine reading. I consider the following as the most likely: *fórmam huiús, morém, virtútes, hic animum áttinère tvóm*. The following, with the perfect form *attinuēre*, is possible but involves a greater conflict of accent and ictus, and a perfect form not found in any manuscript: *fórma huiús, morés, virtús, hic ánimum attinuēre hic tuóm*.

48. The manuscripts have *tum audiuere* or *tum audiere*, both of which are metrically impossible. Fleckeisen's emendation to *audire* seems to be generally accepted.

III. THE FORMS IN -ERE

A. Problem

§12.

	-ēre unelided	*-ēr*^{e} elided	*-ērunt*	*-ĕrunt*	contracted forms
Plautus	14	37	106	8	10
Terence	4	22	22	1	4

	total	*-ēre* and *-ēr*^{e} % of total	*-ērunt* % of total
Plautus	175	29	60
Terence	53	49	42

These statistics present several problems regarding the use of the forms. In both authors, unelided *-ēre* forms are comparatively rare, and the form with elided *-e* occurs much more frequently than the unelided form. Terence uses *-ēr*^{e} much more often comparatively than does Plautus. How are we to account for these facts?

§13. Few scholars have attempted any explanation. Havet [1] tries to account for the use of *-ēre* and *-ēr*^{e} in Plautus on metrical grounds: 'Quand Plaute n'a besoin ni d'élider la finale ni d'obtenir une brève, il met toujours *-erunt.*' He seems to assume that *-ēr*^{e} is metrically required per se, yet I do not believe that it is demonstrable that *-ēr*^{e} was required by the meter anywhere (or that it was not required). According to Havet, *-ēre* is used for metrical reasons four times: *exsoluēre* 29 [2], to secure a pure bacchius [3]; *occalluēre* 10 and *commeminere* 91, to secure a pure iamb in the seventh foot of the iambic septena-

1. Rev. Phil. 31.230-3.
2. References to perfect forms are here given according to the order in which they appear in the List (§9-§11), though Havet refers to play and line.
3. Plautus occasionally permits substitution in bacchiac meters: Lindsay ELV 290.

rius [4]; *inière* 41, 'le groupe *-ēre quo* procure un ïambe qui est recherché, à cette place du trochaïque, quand il y a séparation des mots entre le septième et le huitième demi-pieds'. [5] For the other examples of *-ēre*: Havet explains 68 and 115 on a non-metrical basis [6]; fails to mention 57, 78, and 127; questions the authenticity of 46, 61, 77, 111, 112.

I cannot agree that the *-ĕ* of *-ērĕ* is absolutely required by the meter in a single instance; but granting that *-ĕ* was metrically desirable in the four instances which Havet mentioned, the fact that this happens in four out of fourteen occurrences of the ending does not prove that Plautus ever used *-ērĕ* merely to secure a short syllable. Havet offers no explanation for the *-ēr^e^* forms in Terence [7]; by implication, from a comparison with Plautus, he assumes that Terence did not use *-ēr^e^* for metrical reasons.

§14. Muller, in the most recent work on the subject [8], tries to establish other reasons for the use of *-ēre* and *-ēr^e^* forms, though he accepts the general conclusions of Havet. I quite agree with his assumption that all *-ēre* forms which are well attested should be considered Plautine, and cannot summarily be rejected. Some of his suggestions on the use of single forms will be mentioned later, when those forms are discussed separately.

Muller's suggestion [9], on the basis of a statement by Quintilian [10], that several *-ēre* forms (111, 112, 113) were used because *-ēre* was taken as a dual at the time of Plautus, is impossible. There is no evidence that any contemporary of Plautus ever thought of a dual in Latin.

Equally impossible is Muller's theory [11] that the use of *-ēre* and *-ēr^e^*

4. A pure iamb in this position is not absolutely required in Plautus: Lindsay ELV 275-6. Havet regards *egērunt* 67 as corrupt.

5. I am not acquainted with this metrical principle, and Havet does not give any other example to support the rule.

6. Cf. §18. e, and §19. c.

7. For Havet's remarks on the use of *-ēre* in Terence, cf. § 30.

8. 332-41 (on Plautus and Terence).

9. 331, 334-5.

10. Inst. Or. 1.5.42-4. Quintilian himself opposes the theory. Havet did not, as Muller implies, suggest that *-ēre* was considered a dual at the time of Plautus; Havet believed that Nos. 111, 112, and 113, were non-Plautine, and suggested that *-erunt* might have been changed to *-ēre* after the time of Plautus, by someone who believed that *-ere* was a dual form. This is more probable than Muller's theory, though I believe that the *-ēre* forms referred to are Plautine.

11. 335-8.

in Plautus can be explained by assuming that the poet and his contemporaries believed that *-ēre* was a new ending, a shortened form of *-ērunt* (though *-ēre* actually is older than *-ērunt*). By a comparison with the use of second singular passives in *-ris* (a new form) and *-re* in Plautus and Terence, he shows that *-ērunt* must have been developed (by contamination, he believes, of *-ĕrunt* and *-ēre*) long before the time of Plautus, and must have been in regular use by 200 B.C. I agree that *-ērunt* was well established at that time, though I do not accept the current theory that *-ērunt* was developed by contamination of *-ĕrunt* and *-ēre*. The assumption that Romans at the end of the third century B.C. did not realize that *-ēre* was an older ending, but considered it a shortened form of *-ērunt*, is also plausible. It is quite possible that no Roman within the historical period ever realized that *-ēre* was older in origin than *-ērunt*. Since such eminent authorities as Varro, Cicero, and Quintilian believed that *-ēre* was developed from *-ērunt*, there is every reason to believe that Plautus held the same view, if he thought of the relation of the endings at all. In fact, it is difficult to see how a Roman could arrive at any other explanation.

But I cannot accept the conclusion that Plautus or people in his time believed that *-ēre* was a new ending and used it accordingly. Muller admits that Terence could not have regarded *-ēre* as a new form[12], because he generally avoided new forms but used this ending very frequently. Yet I cannot understand why Terence should have had any other belief concerning the relation of the endings than had Plautus, Varro, and others. The people whose speech is represented in the comedies of Plautus were probably guided in their use of the various perfect endings by natural linguistic tendencies. They used certain forms unconsciously, or in imitation of the speech of others, or in certain connotations (as in legal phrases). Though an old form may be deliberately employed in imitation of the usage of an earlier period, this fact does not justify the assumption that usage is based upon theories or beliefs concerning phonetic development. One must make this assumption to accept Muller's theory, since the derivation of *-ēre* from *-ērunt* cannot be explained.

However, he must be commended for his attempt to explain every phase of the use of the endings. Even where he is wrong in principle, he tries to be accurate. He makes an effort to show that *-ērunt* was a weak ending at the time of Plautus, particularly before vowels, and

12. 340.

seeks to account for the frequent use of elided $-\bar{e}r^{e}$ on this basis. The only example from Plautus which he cites to prove his contention that the final sounds of *-ērunt* were weak, is *accessēre tibi* 68.[13] He explains that the final *-t* of *-ērunt* was lost before the initial *t-* of the following word, that *-ērun* weakened to *-ēru*ⁿ, and finally to *-ēru*. The use of $-\bar{e}r^{e}$ is compared with the use of *mag* and *sat* (presumably for *magis, satis*) before words beginning with vowels, in Early Latin. The relation of *magis*, *mage*, and *mag* is extremely dubious, and Leo's theory[14] of the elision of the *-is* ending before vowels is generally questioned. Final *-s* was weak before consonants in Old Latin and in Plautus and Terence[15], but the weakness of *-s* before vowels is not certainly demonstrable (*qualist* for *qualis est*, and *malust* for *malus est*, were probably caused by haplology). On the other hand, final *-m* was weak and was regularly elided before vowels, but was not lost before consonants in Plautus and Terence. Final *-n* (of words such as *nomen*) was not lost in Plautus or in Terence, before vowels or before consonants, and presumably *-n* was a stronger sound than *-m* at that time.[16] The comparison with *mag* before vowels does not prove that *-erunt* was a weak ending, and does not account for the use of $-\bar{e}r^{e}$ before vowels. Though there is evidence for the weakening of *-ērunt* to *-ēru* in Late Latin and in early dialectal inscriptions, one cannot, on this basis, assume that *-ērunt* was weak in Plautus.

B. Aim and Method

§15. The explanations offered by the articles of Havet and Muller have by no means solved the problems involved. The present writer proposes to show that Plautus used *-ēre* and $-\bar{e}r^{e}$ only in certain limited significations which may be ascribed to conservative tendencies in the language; that the information to be derived from Plautus indicates that *-ēre* (including $-\bar{e}r^{e}$) was an old ending which had almost disappeared from colloquial Latin; that Terence used *-ēre* and $-\bar{e}r^{e}$ because they were characteristic of conservative Latin, and for metrical reasons.

13. 333-4.
14. Plautinische Forschungen² 292-301; Berlin, 1912.
15. Leumann-Stolz, §156.
16. Leumann-Stolz, §155, §246. The loss of final *-n*, and of *-m* before consonants, is not a feature of the Latin of Plautus.

§16. In Plautus, the context sometimes makes the signification of the endings to the audience quite clear. Words, phrases, or verses which seem to me to throw light upon the use of the perfect ending, will hereafter often be quoted. I have not considered it necessary to follow this procedure consistently, especially for *-ēr*[e]. Translation into English has been avoided, since translation cannot indicate the connotation with which the forms were used in Latín.

C. *-ēre* in Plautus

§17. Forms in *-ēre* are most often used by Plautus in legal language, in mock-heroic language, in narrative — normally with comic effect. I have included, under the same headings, a number of forms in *-ēr*[e] which occur in phrases of formal, non-colloquial character.

§18. In legal language : The conservative, formulaic character of legal and judicial language is too well known to require any vindication here. One may expect to find forms which had disappeared from everyday speech in expressions of this type.

§18. a. *iniēre* 41 : The legal character of the phrase *qui consilium iniere* is confirmed by *is diem dicam*, and *inrogabo multam* of the following verse. These phrases are spoken by the parasite Ergasilus in the Captivi.

§18. b. *fecēre* 46 : Later in the same play, lines 790-828, Hegio overhears the parasite talking in similar vein. He marvels at the domineering (*imperiosus*) nature of the parasite, line 806 ; at his *basilicas edictiones atque imperiosas*, line 811 ; then, in lines 823-4, bursts out with :

> *Eugepae. Edictiones aedilicias hic quidem habet*
> *mirumque adeost ni hunc fecēre sibi Aetoli agoranomum.*

The reference to the law court and to the aedile makes the connection with formal legal language unmistakable. *Fecēre* 46 is certainly in mockery of the language of the parasite.

§18. c. *occalluēre* 10 : The phrase *quae occalluēre plagis* is used by an audacious slave who has been characterized as *imperiosus* (As.

***

410), the same adjective that was applied to Ergasilus and to legal edicts above.

§18. d. *crepuēre* 61 : This word occurs in a passage of the Curculio, 462-86, attributed to the Choragus, who appears nowhere else in the play. He speaks of places in and near the Forum in which various types of disreputable men may be found. I take the passage to be a parody on a recent speech or edict that was decidedly unpopular. The sentences in lines 470–2, beginning with the relative pronoun *qui* and with the imperative forms *ito* and *quaerito* [17], are similar to phrases frequently found in old laws. Therefore, *crepuēre* is presumably used in imitation of legal language. *Crepuērunt*, including *concrepuērunt*, is always used elsewhere in Plautus and in Terence, ten times.

§18. e. *accessēre* 68 : Havet stated that *ei quae accessēre* seems to be a citation of a juristic formula, perhaps with comic force [18]; I agree with this interpretation.

§18. f. *evenēre* 77 : *Quoniam haec evenēre..... nostra | ex sententia* in itself appears to be legal in tone. The context supports this assumption quite definitely. The slave Messenio has just been set free; in Men. 1148 there are two phrases which are undoubtedly formulaic : *liber esto,* and *quom tu es tiber, gaudeo.* The hiatus after *nostra* suggests that the phrase at the end of verse 1151 was pronounced *nostrad ex sententiad* at the time of Plautus, and was taken directly from legal language. [19] Ablatives in *-d* are regularly found in the Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus of 186 B.C. [20] *Evenēre* surely belongs to legal diction in this instance.

17. Lane-Morgan, §1575 : The third person (of the imperative), and the longer forms of the second person, are used particularly in laws, legal documents, and treaties, and also in impressive general rules or maxims.

18. Rev. Phil. 31.230.

19. The inference has been drawn, from Men. 407-12, that this comedy was staged before the death of Hiero, tyrant of Syracuse (270-215 B.C.). Cf. Brix-Niemeyer, 4th ed. of Menaechmi, pp. 5-6 (Leipzig, 1891); or H. N. Fowler, Introd. to edition of Menaechmi, pp. 23-4 (Boston, 1900). However, it is difficult to imply that old ablatives in *-d* were regularly used in normal colloquial Latin at the time when the play was written.

20. CIL I^2 581 ; but IN AGRO TEVRANO, probably a titular addition, occurs at the end of the inscription.

§19. In mock-heroic language : Many of the phrases to be given here are apparently quotations from tragedy. Though it cannot be stated with absolute certainty that any of the expressions is taken directly or indirectly from tragedy, it seems obvious that they are modeled on some type of formal language. It is perhaps impossible, but at any rate unnecessary for my purpose, to fix a specific source in any instance.

§19. a. *Fecēre tale ante aliei spectatei virei.* (No. 78)
humanum amarest, humanum autem ignoscere est :

These statements, perhaps quotations from tragedy, are made by Demipho, the white-haired and decrepit old lover in the Mercator, in self-defense against rather pointed criticism and ridicule. There is some possibility that the diction of old men is involved, but I regard that as unlikely. Demipho's use of heroic speech makes him appear all the more ridiculous to the audience.

§19. b. *Exsoluēre quanti fuēr*^{e} 29, 30, is quite similar to the preceding example. The subject of age is again involved, but this statement is made about the old men, and not by them. I believe that the *-ēre* forms are used for mock-heroic effect.

§19. c. *fuēre* 115 : Havet [21] noticed that this form was used by a soldier in relating his own exploits, and suggested that it was tragic in tone. [22]

§19. d. *adbibēr*^{e} 90 : *Postquam adbibēr*^{e} *aures meae tuam oram orationis*, in the Miles Gloriosus, is meant to be in lofty style, and is perhaps a quotation. There is a plot afoot to trick the soldier (in this case, the Braggart Soldier), as the remainder of the sentence reveals:

21. Rev. Phil. 31.231 : Le miles raconte ses exploits sur un ton moins vulgaire, sans doute le ton de la tragédie (il serait même possible qu'il y eût ici parodie d'un vers tragique déterminé).

22. Muller, 335, associates with the use of *fuēre* the form *deico* (Po. 474) : forma per *ei* scripta perraro occurrit et senibus tantum sive personis amplis gravioribusque tribuitur. I consider the manuscript tradition on the spelling of the original *ei*-diphthongs as entirely unreliable ; at the time of Plautus, the original diphthongs were probably always written *ei*. Cf. A.R. Anderson, Trans. of the Amer. Phil. Assoc. 37.73-86 (1906), who says, page 85 : ' The *ei*-readings as a whole, far from going back to Plautus himself, do not go back even to the common archetype of our two families of Mss. '

tibi dixi, quem ad modum miles potisset deasciarei. The figurative use of *oram* has been suggested in §9, note 22. It must be admitted, however, that elided *-ĕr*^{e} does not necessarily suggest formal language of this type.

§19. e. *Equŏs quem misĕr*^{e} *Achivi ligneum* 27, occurs in a passage that is clearly mock-heroic in style. This mythological allusion may well have been taken directly from tragedy.

§20. In narrative: The events referred to are usually, but perhaps not always, of serious and solemn character. There is no great distinction between mock-heroic language and formal narrative, and it is not strange that the old form *-ĕre* (and *-ĕr*^{e}) is used in both types of expressions. It is also possible that the conservative language of popular stories such as fables (§79, §81), is responsible for some of the *-ĕre* and *-ĕr*^{e} forms which are here listed.

§20. a. *Periĕre* 127, is spoken by Hanno the Carthaginian. Reference is here made to the disappearance of Carthaginian children who were kidnapped by slave traders. It is hardly probable that there is any mockery intended in Hanno's use of the *-ĕre* form.[23] Hanno seems to be treated with respect by other characters throughout the play (the Poenulus), and is not apparently despised as a Carthaginian. I assume that the ending *-ĕre* conveys an impression of unfeigned solemnity in this instance.

§20. b. *fuĕre* 111, 112; *periĕr*^{e} 113: These three forms occur in the prologue of the same play; they are also used in portraying tragic events, and are apparently spoken in quite serious tone. The reversion to a bantering tone in following lines, supports this assumption. The joke in Po. 89, *homini, si leno est homo*, affords a contrast which is quite in keeping with the spirit of Plautine comedy; Plautus does not bore his audience by harping upon a serious subject at too great length.

This prologue is one of those which many scholars reject as non-Plautine. I see no reason to doubt its genuineness because of these perfect forms.

23. But the disappearance of Carthaginian children may not have been as serious a matter to the Roman audience as it was to Hanno.

§20. c. *Fuēre* 57 is quite similar to the examples in §20. b. It also occurs at the beginning of the synopsis of a play, but not in a prologue. Though the passage is attributed to a god, Auxilium, I do not believe that the use of *fuēre* is to be associated with this fact.[24] Gods do not seem to use particularly formal language anywhere in the comedies of Plautus. There is ample reason for a serious tone in the events that are narrated in the following lines.

§20. d. *Dircam.... devinxēr^e ad taurum* 133, alluding to a mythological episode, may have been taken from tragedy. It is followed by a joke: *item ego te distringam ad carnarium; id tibi profecto taurus fiet.* This and the following example may show the influence of fables or similar stories (§79, §81).

§20. e. *Occepēr^e* 66, is used by Epidicus, in the play of the same name. It seems to be used in ordinary narrative, without any suggestion of solemnity.

Pertulēr^e 4, and *cepēr^e* 108, occur in narration of military events, but do not apparently convey any impression of mockery or of seriousness.

§21. In general, the forms given in §18 to §20.e, seem to have been used for special effects, and were not used in ordinary speech. This is especially true of the *-ere* forms, all except one of which have been connected with formal or archaic language: I have found no way to associate *commeminēre* 91 with the foregoing. However, it is possible that there was some influence of formal language connected with the use of this form in *-ēre*. It may be stated that the sentence in which *commeminēre* occurs is apparently spoken in a tone of disgust.

It remains to be seen whether other forms in *-ēr^e*, only a few of which have thus far been discussed, indicate any reasons why the elided ending is more frequent than unelided *-ēre*.

D. *-ēr^e* in Plautus

§22. The ending *-ēr^e*, before a word beginning with a vowel, occurs 37 times, or 21% of all perfects in Plautus, and almost three times as often as *-ēre* (14 times). Even in the preceding examples (§19.b–§20.e, in which *-ēr^e* is found in formal phrases) the ending

24. Cf. Muller, 335, note 1: Hoc quoque stili requisitioris est, qualis deo sive daemone 'in ornatu prologi' dignus est?

-ēr^{e} alone does not seem to have any special force, as *-ēre* often has. The ending *-ēr^{e}* must have remained in ordinary colloquial language, at least under certain conditions.

However, it is quite natural to expect that the elided forms should show some signs of disappearing, especially since *-ērunt* is used much more often. The ending *-ēr^{e}* occurs in certain fixed colloquial expressions, so common that they have become more or less traditional: in adages, proverbs, and popular sayings; in uses which have some features in common with sayings, as of repeated or customary acts or events; in religious expressions; perhaps in some common phrases.

§23. In adages, proverbs, and popular sayings: Sayings which are apt and striking, are likely to become fixed in colloquial language, and are sometimes handed down by tradition, becoming proverbs or adages. Naturally these sayings would be quoted verbatim, and might preserve old forms longer than other expressions. Since *-ēre* is not found in such sayings, I am of the opinion that *-ēr^{e}* remained for rhythmic (or accentual) reasons (§6, §46).

Operta quae fuēr^{e} aperta sunt 43, is an example of this type of expression. Substitution of dissyllabic *-ērunt* for monosyllabic *-ēr^{e}* would interfere with the rhythmic quality of this phrase, yet there would be no such objection to the substitution of *-ḗrunt* for *-ḗre* (unelided). Other apparent examples of such sayings are: 32, 88, 106, 144, 162.

§24. Any statement may, of course, be made in such a way as to have the force of a proverb or an adage, even though it has not been handed down by tradition. Many of the examples listed below may actually be sayings quoted by the poet. If they are, they will help to indicate the way in which other expressions, which are certainly not of proverbial character, are associated with traditional sayings. The important point is that they are intended to have at least some of the force of common sayings, and that *-ēr^{e}* is used.

§24. a. In strong asseverations, often with iterative force also: *scelestiorem nullum inluxēr^{e} alterum* 20; especially with the affirmative *ita*[25]: 45, 60, 159 (but cf. §26).

§24. b. Of repeated or customary acts or events: *quando accubuēr^{e}* 89; 13, 55, 59, 171.

25. Lane-Morgan, §1512, §1937, §2159.

§24. c. To emphasize the permanence or continuity of a present state resulting from a past act or event : Compare *alii se suspendēr*^{e} 164 with *alii exsulatum abiērunt* 163 ; others are : *reliquēr*^{e} 23, 75 ; *periēr*^{e} 99, 102, 131, 161, perhaps 113[26]; *transfugēr*^{e} 87.

§25. In religious expressions : I take these, like other common sayings, to be characteristic of popular language ; that is, *-ēr*^{e} presumably survived for the same reasons which caused this ending to be retained in other common expressions. *Quom nos di juvēr*^{e} 53 ; *Venerem placavēr*^{e} 125 ; *di inmortales voluēr*^{e} 137.

§26. There is also a possibility that *-ēr*^{e} survived longer in certain common combinations of words. The phrases *auctóres fvḗr*^{e} *ut* 159, 208 t, *labóres fvḗr*^{e} 189 t, and *venēr*^{e} *in mentem* 194 t, 207 t, suggest such combinations. The rhythm or word accent again seems to be a prominent factor. A few words, such as *fuēr*^{e} (§39.a) and *periēr*^{e} (§41.e), may have preserved the old ending longer because of their meanings and the connotations with which they were used. It seems best, however, to attempt to explain each example separately, as a part of the phrase in which it is used, rather than to assume that a form such as *periēr*^{e} became somewhat stereotyped, and that the *-ēr*^{e} ending persisted longer for that reason.

§27. *Meminēr*^{e} 58, occurs in a fragment. I cannot associate with the above uses *voluēr*^{e} 22 or *infuēr*^{e} 151. Perhaps they were used merely for metrical reasons ; the *-ēr*^{e} forms had not entirely disappeared from the colloquial language, and it is not to be expected that the poet could, in writing verse, always restrict the form to expressions in which *-ēr*^{e} was actually current in popular speech.

§28. Whatever the exact interpretation of any single occurrence of a form may be, it is evident from the preceding discussion that *-ēre* and *-ēr*^{e} were disappearing from colloquial Latin at the time of Plautus. The ending *-ēre* had practically disappeared from everyday speech. Though *-ēr*^{e} was still current in the colloquial language, it is most frequently found in expressions which are apt to preserve archaic forms.

26. Cf. §20.b.

E. *-ēre* AND *-ērᵉ* IN TERENCE

§29. The usage of Terence in regard to these endings is quite different from that of Plautus. The ending *-ēre*, used 4 times in Terence, is comparatively as rare as in Plautus. In other respects, there is little resemblance between the usages in the two authors. The endings *-ērᵉ* and *-ērunt* are used an equal number of times in Terence (22 times each), but in Plautus the ratio is almost one to three (*-ērᵉ* 37 times, *-ērunt* 106 times). The fact that 12 out of 22 occurrences of *-ērunt* in Terence, are found before a final iambic word, almost suggests that Terence avoided this ending except for metrical reasons. Such a view is not tenable, however.

§30. *-ēre* : I find nothing to indicate that Terence used this ending as Plautus did. *Dixēre causam* 213 t, may be in imitation of the legal expression, but it is not used in the special signification in which we find such phrases with *-ēre* forms in Plautus (§18-§18.f). There is no obvious significance in the use of *-ēre* forms in Terence, except that in three out of four instances the final *-ĕ* of *-ērĕ* secures a pure iamb where the corresponding Greek meter would require an iamb[27] : 189 t, 213 t, and 227 t; *ostendēre* 206 t secures an iamb where even Greek would not require one.

§31. *-ērᵉ* : There are no *-ērᵉ* forms in Terence which appear to be used in popular sayings, nor is there evidence for the use of *-ērᵉ* in obviously formal phrases. But it is entirely probable that Terence used this ending in certain fixed expressions (which may have been used in conservative language, as well as in popular speech). We find *auctores fvērᵉ ut* 208 t, exactly as in 159, and *labores fvērᵉ* 189 t; *venērᵉ in mentem* 194 t, 207 t. There may be other examples of such phrases in Terence, but, in general, the poet does not seem to distinguish between *-ērᵉ* and *-ērunt*.

§32. The difference in usage is quite in accord with the distinctions between the two poets which have already been mentioned (§6). Terence could hardly have had objection to using forms characteristic of conservative tendencies in language. Presumably, they were used

27. Havet, Rev. Phil. 31.232.

to a greater extent by the aristocratic group with which Terence was associated, and in formal literature. It is quite probable that Terence found *-ēre* and *-ēr^e* forms a convenient aid in securing the air of refinement at which he aimed. Equally important is the metrical convenience, particularly of the *-ēr^e* forms, since they consist of one syllable less than those in *-ērunt*. The fact that he uses the endings *-ēr^e* and *-ērunt* an equal number of times seems to show that Terence took advantage of this convenience. The ending *-ērunt* was doubtless well established in conservative language as well as in colloquial speech, and could not have been avoided as a mere colloquialism.[28]

§33. The usage in Terence confirms the theory that *-ēre* (and *-ēr^e*) was actually disappearing from colloquial Latin at the time of Plautus and Terence. The ending *-ēre* seems to have disappeared even from the everyday language of conservative speakers. Though *-ēr^e* was still used, it seems quite possible to assume that this ending was also disappearing.

28. Cf. Muller's conclusion that *-ērunt* was well established by 200 B.C. (§14).

IV. THE FORMS IN -RUNT

A. Aim and Method

§34. The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the occurrence of the perfect endings in *-ērunt*, *-ĕrunt*, and of the contracted forms.[1] My conclusion is that *-ērunt* was the prevailing perfect ending in colloquial Latin at the time of Plautus and Terence, but no conclusions concerning the probable origin of the endings are set forth at this point. An attempt is made to see whether any words or types of words show any special characteristics, either in the perfect endings that are used, or in the accent of the forms. The examples are arranged in groups as follows: *-āv-* and *-ōv-* perfects; *-ēv-* and *-īv-* perfects; perfects with radical *-ē-*, type *feci*; *-s-* perfects, type *dixi*; *fui*; words of the type *dedi* and *perdidi* (perfect stem[2] consists of a single short syllable or of a long syllable followed by a short syllable); words of the type *abii* (perfect stem consists of two short syllables); words of the type *constitui* (perfect stem consists of a long syllable followed by two short syllables). When there are several instances of the perfect ending for a certain word, and the perfect endings of the word show any significant features, the word will be discussed separately under the appropriate group. On the other hand, no direct reference will be made to some words for which only the ending *-ērunt*, of the *-runt* endings of the perfect, is found. Compounds will not always be distinguished from the uncompounded forms (*fecerunt* may in the discussion represent *adfecerunt* also). The instances of the various *-runt* forms in Terence are mentioned along with those in Plautus; they often serve to confirm certain tendencies in the

1. Real or so-called (cf. §53). For want of any other term that would be clear, I shall regularly use the term 'contracted' of short forms such as those in *-ārunt*.

2. Perfect stem, in this dissertation, regularly means the first person singular perfect indicative active minus the final *-i*: e. g., the perfect stem of *dare* is assumed to be *ded-*.

latter, but because of the small number of instances in Terence, the discussion will be primarily on the usage in Plautus. Forms in *-ēre* and *-ĕre* will not be mentioned unless there is a relatively great number of instances of these endings for any particular word in Plautus.

B. Study of the Occurrences

§35. *-āv-* and *-ōv-* perfects : *-āvērúnt* occurs twice in Plautus, *conciliāvērúnt* 122 and *lāvērúnt* 141, in both instances before a final iambic word. *Nōvērúnt* occurs once in Terence, 188 t, also before a final iambic word.[3] *-āvĕrunt* occurs three times in Plautus: *locāvĕrunt* 107 and *devitāvĕrunt* 142 at the end of senarii; *travolāvĕrunt* 65, at the beginning of a trochaic septenarius. In the last instance, *-ĕ-* is not required by the meter, but coincidence of word accent and verse ictus favors the adoption of *-ĕrunt*, especially since there are two clear examples of *-āvĕrunt*. *-ārunt* is found 6 times in Plautus, 3 times in Terence: *invocārunt* 1, *iterārunt* 3, *comparārunt* 35, *cessārunt* 98, *adlegārunt* 124, *impetrārunt* 129, *factitārunt* 199 t, *conlocārunt* 201 t, *migrārunt* 224 t. *Nōrunt* is twice found before a final iambic word in Plautus : 49, 132. *Lāvērunt* 141 is not an *-āv-* perfect in formation, but it has the same combination of sounds as *-āv-* perfects, and has been included here for that reason.

§35 a. There are several notable features in the above examples. The final *-ā-* of the stem of *-āv-* perfects always bears the verse ictus in these forms, even when followed by *-ērunt*. The contracted forms are very numerous, comprising 11 out of 17 forms for which contraction would be possible, or 65 °/₀. In Plautus, *-ārunt* is found in 6 out of 11 instances of the *-āv-* perfect in *-runt*, or 54 °/₀ ; *nōrunt*, in both instances of the perfect of this word. Terence always has *-ārunt* for the *-āv-* perfect : 3 times. Do other forms of the perfect tenses show as great a tendency to contraction ?

§35. b. The following is the statement of Sommer[4] on this point: Während auch bei Plautus die vollere Form noch sehr gebräuchlich ist..., hat Terenz normalerweise die kontrahierte..., die unkontrahierten sind (mit Ausnahme von *dēcrēuērunt* And. 219) dem

3. Luchs's Law ; cf. §3.
4. Sommer, 563-4.

Versende vorbehalten. This statement formulates correctly the fact that only *-ārunt* is found in Terence. An examination of other *-āvĕr-* and *-ōvĕr-* forms of the perfects tenses in four plays of Plautus (Am., Cap., Mi., Po., in which *-ārunt* occurs 6 times, *-ōrunt* once, *-āvērunt* once), yielded the following results : *-āvĕr-* was found 16 times[5], but *-ār-* 3 times[6], or 16 °/₀ of the total ; *-ōvĕr-* 10 times[7], but *-ōr-* 3 times[8], or 23 °/₀ of the total. All except three of the 26 forms in *-vĕr-* occur at verse ends. This fact suggests that the uncontracted forms were used primarily for metrical reasons, but one should compare the following figures on the second person singular and plural of the perfect indicative in the same plays: *-āvisti(s)* occurs 18 times[9] ; *-āsti(s)* 7 times[10], or 28 °/₀ of the total.[11] Metrical reasons can hardly account for the greater tendency to use contracted forms in *-ārunt* in Plautus, 54 °/₀ of all *-runt* endings of *-āv-* perfects (including *lāvērunt*). A reason to account for the apparently greater tendency to contraction in third plural perfects, as compared with the tendency in other forms of the perfect tenses in which contraction is possible, will be given later (§53).

§36.a. *-ēv-* perfects : There are only five occurrences in Plautus and two in Terence. *Consvēvē'runt* 7 may possibly be read as *consuē'-runt*, with the manuscripts, but there is no other example of vocalization of *-v-* after *s-* in Plautus.[12] For *consvēvēr^e* 13, the manuscript reading *consuere* may also be correct, though there is no parallel for

5. Am. 53, 136, 313, 383, 741 ; Cap. 127, 314 ; Mi. 66, 132, 263, 432, 526 ; Po. 93, 451, 601, 702.

6. Cap. 691 ; Mi. 1415 ; Po. 450.

7. Cap. 459, 542 ; Mi. 575, 923, 925 ; Po. 744, 877, 1117, 1335, 1384.

8. Cap. 509 (mss. *nouerit*, in a canticum) ; Po. 874 bis (*norit norit*, repetition by same speaker).

9. Am. 717, 735, 767, 800, 804, 1034 (frag. 7) ; Cap. 445, 514, 672 bis, 717 ; Mi. 17, 495, 506, 510 ; Po. 361, 416, 1239.

10. Am. 304, 797 ; Cap. 677, 929 ; Mi. 382 (mss. *-auisti*), 1269 ; Po. 562.

11. Contracted forms in *-āss-*, (type) *amāssem* from (type) *amāvissem*, seem to occur more frequently than *-āsti(s)* ; but here I suspect that forms of the type *amāsso* may have had some influence. Therefore, I am inclined to accept the theory of E. H. Sturtevant (Classical Philology 6.221 [1911]) that *capso*, *faxim*, etc., prevented the change from original **amāso* to **amāro*, and that the desire to avoid rhotacism of the significant *s* led to the pronunciation *amāsso* ; cf. note 16. But there is a view that *-āssem* had an analogical influence on the formation of *-āssō* (Leumann-Stolz, §250, B. 2).

12. Lindsay ELV, 218.

contraction of *-ēre* forms.[13] *Consvērunt* 118 is a clear example of a contracted form of this verb (though the manuscripts have *consueuerunt*).

In No. 162, the reading of P (*succreuerunt*) may represent Plautine *succrērunt*. I have preferred to adopt *succrēvēr*ᵉ (A). The remaining instance of an *-ēv-* perfect in Plautus is *sublēvēr*ᵉ 45.

Terence has *decrērunt* 216 t, and *decrēvērunt* 178t.

§36. b. *-īv-* perfects: *Scīvērūnt* 123 and *trīvē'runt* 136 are the only clear examples. Though the manuscripts have *dormierunt* (*-iĕrunt*)[14], I prefer to read *dormīrunt* 110. However, Leumann-Stolz[15] states that short ('contracted') forms of the fourth conjugation are not found. From the manuscript confusion indicated in §9, note 26, it seems possible that some Plautine *-īr-* forms (from *-īvĕr-*) were changed by copyists to *-ier-*. The statistics given in §35. b show that forms in *-āvĕr-* were by Plautus much preferred to *-ār-* forms (except *-ārunt*). The *-īv-* perfects (not including those of *eo* and its compounds) are not nearly so common as *-āv-* perfects. Therefore, we need not expect to find many *-īr-* forms from *-īvĕr-* in Plautus, but there may have been a few. Thus I believe that *sīrint* Mer. 613, is a perfect subjunctive from *sīvĕrint*[16], and I take *dormīrunt* to be derived from *dormīvērunt* by analogy with *invocārunt* from *invocāvērunt* (§53). There is very little possibility of associating *dormiĕrunt* (as required by the

13. However, the manuscripts cannot be greatly relied upon in instances in which haplography (or dittography) might have been possible. Since there is no clear evidence for Plautine *su-* for *sv-*, it seems safer to assume that Plautus here used uncontracted forms.

14. Sommer, 567 (citing Leo, adn. ad loc.), doubts whether *dormiĕrunt* is Plautine; cf. note 17.

15. §244. 1. b.

16. This explanation seems more probable to me than the theory (Leumann-Stolz, §250. B. 2; Sommer, 581) that *sīrint* is an aorist form derived from **sei-sī-* (cf. *faxim*). The *s* in *capso*, *faxim*, etc., would tend to prevent rhotacism in other aorist forms (cf. Sturtevant's theory on the origin of *-āsso*, note 11). The phrase *ne di sīvĕrint* at a verse end in Mer. 323, supports the assumption that *sīrint* is a perfect subjunctive form. A rhythmic reason may account for the comparatively frequent occurrence of contracted forms with *sīr-* from *sīvĕr-* (Plautus usually prefers the longer forms with *-vĕr-*, §35. b). In combination with the word *di*, there are two rhythmic possibilities: *di si'verint*, or *di sīrint*. It seems quite probable that there might have been a tendency to accent *di*, and that *di sīrint* was a commonly used phrase; that other 'contracted' forms of this verb in the same paradigm (*sīrīs*, *sīrītis*) were used by analogy with *sīrint*.

manuscripts) with a form of *eo*[17], since *-ĕrunt* cannot be established definitely in even a single instance, for *eo* and the compounds of *eo* (§41. c). In general, *-ēv-* and *-īv-* perfects occur too rarely to furnish any definite evidence for or against the conclusions reached for *-āv-* and *-ōv-* perfects.

§37. Type *fēci* : In Plautus; words with radical *-ē-* in the perfect stem are found with the ending *-ē'runt* 13 times, with *-ērúnt* before a final iambic word 6 times (and 3 times in Terence), with *-ĕrunt* 4 times (and once in Terence). *Fēcĕrunt* 2 occurs at the end of the fourth foot of an iambic octonarius, *subēgĕrunt* 26 at the end of an iambic octonarius, *fēcĕrunt* 74 at the end of a catalectic trochaic verse (of doubtful authenticity), *occēpĕrunt* 172 at the end of a trochaic septenarius, and *ēmĕrunt* 198 t at the end of an iambic senarius. The following are the instances in which words with *-ĕrunt* forms occur with *-ērunt* : *fēcē'runt* 19, 116, 147, 175 ; *fēcērúnt* 64, 95, 157, 185 t. *Occēpē'runt* 8 ; *occēpērúnt* 21, 173 ; *cēpērúnt* 44, 222 t ; *ēgē'runt* 67 ; *exēmē'runt* 48.

§37. a. It seems significant that 7 out of 8 instances of *-ĕrunt* in Plautus,and the one in Terence, are forms of perfects with *-āv-* or radical *-ē-*. Perfects of the latter type, however, have *-ērunt* quite frequently. *Occēpērúnt* 173 occurs in the line following *occēpĕrunt* 172.

§38. Type *dixi* : These *-s-* perfects have *-ē'runt* 16 times in Plautus, 2 times in Terence ; *-ērunt* before a final iambic word 6 times in Plautus, once in Terence. There is nothing of particular significance in the perfect endings of common words of this type : *duxērúnt* 31, 100, 143, 167, 192 t, and *duxērúnt* 218 t ; *dixē'runt* 119, 219 t and *dixērúnt* 83 ; *misē'runt* 52, and *misērúnt* 146 ; *sensē'runt* 134, and *sensērúnt* 69 ; *jussē'runt* 81, 94; *confinxērúnt* 34, 36. The only notable feature in the use of *-s-* perfects is that the ending *-ĕrunt* does not occur at all.[18]

17. I assume that Sommer (566) is correct in asserting that *-iī* is not to be considered a 'Zwischenstufe zwischen den vollen und den "kontrahierten" Formen des *u*-Perfekts bei *i*-Verben'. Perfect forms of *eo* and its compounds with *-iī* and *-iĕrunt* (not *-v-* perfects in origin, according to Sommer) are frequent in Plautus, and *dormiĕrunt* could be accepted as by analogy with an *-ĕrunt* perfect of *eo*, if there were definite evidence that *eo* had a third plural perfect in *-ĕrunt* at the time of Plautus. However, it must be admitted the relation of *-iī* and *-īvī* perfects is not clear (Sommer, 566-8 ; Leumann-Stolz, §244.2).

18. This fact is mentioned by Sommer, 579.

§39. *Fui* : In most instances, the perfect ending is quite certain : *fuē'runt* 16, 33, 135, 150, 181t, 183t ; *fuērúnt* in anapaestic meter 109. I have preferred to read *fū'ērunt* 28, also in anapaestic meter (§46), with the quantities here indicated, rather than *fŭĕrúnt* on the basis of an emendation which is otherwise unnecessary. There is no clear example of the perfect ending *-ĕrunt* for this word, but there are parallels for *fū-* (§9, note 7).

§39. a. The fact that *fuēre* occurs 4 times in Plautus (57, 111, 112, 115), and *fuēr^e* 5 times (30, 43, 151, 159, 174), may be of some significance in comparison with the 6 instances of *fuērunt* (16, 28, 33, 109, 135, 150). The verb *fui* was naturally often used in narrative (§20), and in archaic colloquial expressions (§22 -§24. c. ; §26).

§40. Words of the type *dedi* and *perdidi* : There are only two instances of uncompounded words of this type which have perfect endings in *-runt* : *iē'runt* 128 and *dedē'runt* 114. The latter may be scanned *dédĕrunt* (§9, note 27), but in the absence of any certain *-ĕrunt* perfect after a single short vowel, *-ērunt* seems preferable (cf. §40. a and §40. b). *Perdidi, attuli*, etc., certainly have the ending *-ĕrunt* in 16 instances : 11, 12, 15, 17, 47, 51, 54, 62, 79, 97, 139, 155, 165, 166, 184t, 193t ; in one instance, 171, only the palimpsest has *res perdidĕr^e*, and the other manuscripts have *perdídĕrunt res* (probably influenced by a similar combination in dactylic verse, §9 note 39).

§40. a. Four possible instances of the ending *-ĕrunt* preceded by a single short vowel, occur in cantica : *dederunt* 114, *exciderunt* 25 (for which Sommer[19] mentions *-ĕrunt* as a possibility), *exciderunt* 104, and *reddiderunt* 42. I have invariably scanned with *-ē'runt*, with support for my scansion indicated in the note to each of these examples in §9. I am of the opinion that the textual and metrical problems involved in the cantica should be solved by other means than by assuming the existence in these passages of forms that do not occur elsewhere, at least until the metrical principles of the cantica are definitely established. It can be seen from §40 that *-ērunt* is the invariable ending of words of this type where the meter is certain. The principle of coincidence of word accent and verse ictus has seemed to be a safer guide

19. 579.

in determining the scansion even in the cantica than the various technical terms and systems devised by modern scholars.

§40. b. Nothing seems to be gained by assuming that the *ē* of *-ērunt* was shortened by the iambic principle in any instance in which *-ĕrunt* after a single short vowel is metrically possible [20] : 25, 28, 42, 104, 114. Syllables which are long by nature and accented in prose are very rarely affected by iambic shortening.[21] I have preferred to read *-ērunt* in each of the above instances; but if *-ĕrunt* is to be read in any instance, I am convinced that it should be taken as the perfect ending *-ĕrunt*, and not as from *-ērunt* by iambic shortening.

§41. Words of the type *abii* : The quantity of the penultimate vowel in words like *abierunt* (whose perfect stem consists of two short syllables) can be definitely ascertained on a purely metrical basis in only 3 of 33 occurrences: *méruĕrúnt* 103 at the end of a trochaic septenarius; *génuērúnt* 138 and *ábiērúnt* 152 in anapaestic verses.

§41. a. Sixteen of the remaining examples may be scanned either (type) *abíĕrunt* or (type) *abiḗrunt*. The initial accent of a quadrisyllable with the first three syllables short is here involved (§4). It has seemed best to compare other forms of the perfect tenses which are certainly quadrisyllables of this value (*habuimus, abierit*, etc.). Four plays of Plautus (Am., Cap., Mi., Po.) have been examined to determine the extent to which the initial accent prevailed in these forms. All except one of the 36 forms found have the verse ictus on the first syllable[22], and on the final syllable unless the final syllable is elided. In only one instance does the verse ictus fall on the second syllable. Presumably an examination of all examples of perfects of this type in Plautus would yield very few instances, if any, of an

20. But the Palatine manuscripts have *dormierunt* (-⏑⏑-) for *dormīrunt* 110, and *perdiderunt* (-⏑⏑-) for *perdidēre* 171. Cf. §36. b, §40.

21. W. Kroll: Iambenkürzung, Glotta 7.152 (1916); Lindsay ELV 35-59. Iambic shortening does not prevent coincidence of word accent and verse ictus, but rather helps to make this coincidence possible. Cf. R. G. Kent, La Lecture à Haute Voix des Vers Latins; in Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement 79. 328-9 (1925).

22. Am. 39, 203, 235, 584b, 695, 807, 922 ; Cap. 53, 143, 248, 309, 314, 339, 398, 800, 1035 ; Mi. 297, 354, 807, 809, 1165, 1176, 1195, 1362 ; Po. 45, 281, 405, 442, 462, 554, 727, 767, 799, 987, 1286. The exception occurs in Cap. 240 : *uti memineris móneo*, at the end of a trochaic octonarius. It is assumed that Terence follows the same principles of accentuation. According to Dziatzko-Hauler (fourth

accent on the second. I have therefore always read (type) *abiĕ'runt* rather than *abiĕrunt* : *abiĕ'runt* 50, 76, 160, 163 ; *periĕ'runt* 5, 72, 145 ; *rediĕ'runt* 37 ; *adiĕ'runt* 179 t ; *meminĕ'runt* 18 ; *voluĕ'runt* 38 ; (*con*)*crepuĕ'runt* 84, 85, 86, 117, 205 t.

§41. b. Type *abierunt* before a final iambic word : A quadrisyllable with the first three syllables short is mentioned by Lindsay as one of the probable exceptions to Luchs's Law (§3). Lindsay mentions the seven 'strong'[23] examples in Plautus, only one of which is a perfect form, *operuit fores* Men. 550. Not one of the 36 examples mentioned in the preceding paragraph occurs before a final iambic word, and the exception in Men. 550 seems to be of too rare a type to throw doubt on the length of the *e* of the type *abiērunt* in this position, especially when 18 examples of words of this type have certain length of the vowel (§41-§41. a). The following are the examples in Plautus and Terence : *abiērunt* 120, 170, 202 t, 226 t ; *periērunt* 130 ; *rediērunt* 182 t ; *tetigērunt* 14 ; *crepuērunt fores* 24, 121, 187 t, 191 t. *Séd concrépuērúnt forés* 56, a complete sentence at the beginning of a verse, seems to be analogous to the same phrase at the end of a verse, and I have scanned it in the same way.

§41. c. *Ábiērúnt* 154 occurs in a position in which the meter does not dictate the quantity of the penultimate syllable. Coincidence of word accent and verse ictus would favor short *e*. There are 17 other instances in which forms of *eo* have the perfect ending in *-ĕrunt* : *iĕ'runt* 128, *exiĕ'runt* 97, *ábiērúnt* 152, and those mentioned in §41. a and §41. b. Since there is, on the other hand, only one certain example of *-ĕrunt* for all words of this type (*meruĕrunt* 103), it seems preferable to scan *ábiērúnt* in 154.

§41. d. One factor which I have considered in reaching the above conclusions must be mentioned. Of the 36 examples of quadrisyllabic perfects beginning with three short syllables (in Am., Cap., Mi., Po.), thirteen occur at the ends of verses in which an iambic close is

edition of the Phormio, pages 61-2 ; Leipzig, 1913), quadrisyllables of the type ⏑⏑⏑⏓ are regularly accented on the first syllable in all meters except the anapaestic. Sturtevant, Classical Philology 14.238-9 (1919), finds 91 % of these quadrisyllables (all types of words — not only the forms of the perfect tenses) accented on the first syllable in Plautus, 88 % in Terence.

23. ELV 271 ; his 'strong' seems to mean 'clear'.

required. A cursory glance at verse ends in several other plays seemed to indicate that the tendency might be found to be more decided in Plautus as a whole. The fact that only *meruĕrunt* 103, out of a total of 26 *-ĕ̄runt* forms for words of the type *abii* in Plautus and 7 in Terence, occurs at the end of a verse which requires an iambic close, seems to indicate that the *e* of (type) *abierunt* was usually considered long.

§41. e. *Perii* quite frequently has the ending *-ēr^e^* in Plautus: *periēr^e^* 99, 102, 113, 131, 161; *periēre* 127; *periērunt* 5, 72, 130, 145. Other compounds of *eo* never have the ending *-ēr^e^* (*inière* occurs in No. 41 [24]) in Plautus, but have *-ērunt* 10 times (cf. §26).

§42. Words of the type *constitui*: *Constituērúnt* 209 t occurs before a final iambic word. In the three instances of perfects of this type in Plautus, there is always a choice between scanning *-úĕrunt* or *-uē'runt*. There can hardly be any doubt that the latter is the correct scansion, on the basis of analogy with the quadrisyllables mentioned above (§ 41. b) [25], and because the perfect ending *-ĕrunt* is rare elsewhere.

The examples are: *deseruē'runt* 101, *desuluē'runt* 140, *complacuē'runt* 148.

C. Summary and Conclusions

§43. *-ērunt*

	-ēre	*-ēr^e^*	*-ērunt*	*-ĕrunt*	contracted forms	total
Plautus	14	37	106	8	10	175
Terence	4	22	22	1	4	53

It has been found that the perfect ending *-ērunt* is used most often with all types of verbs in Plautus, with the exception of *-āv-* and *-ōv-* perfects, and of *fui* and *perii*. Not only does *-ērunt* occur much more often than any other ending in Plautus (60 % of the total) according to the scansions which I have adopted, but there are few instances in which it is at all possible to scan *-ĕrunt* instead. The *-ērunt* and *-ēre*

24. Cf. §18. a.

25. E. H. Sturtevant, Class. Phil. 14. 241-3 (1919), finds that there is a strong tendency in Plautus and Terence to accent words of five syllables of the type -⏑⏑⏑⏓ on the second syllable (70 %), rather than on the antepenult (30 %).

(including *-ēre*) forms comprise 90 °/₀ of the perfect forms in Plautus and in Terence. The endings *-ēre* and *-ēre* have been definitely established as old forms which were disappearing from the colloquial language (§17-§33) and an explanation has been given for the difference in the usage of Terence from that of Plautus (§32). Unless the use of *-ērunt* rather than *-ĕrunt* in Plautus and in Terence can be attributed to metrical requirements, *-ērunt* must be accepted as the prevailing third plural perfect ending in normal Latin at the time of Plautus and Terence.

§44. Contracted forms : Contracted endings in *-ārunt* and *-ōrunt* are comparatively quite numerous. On the other hand, there is a very decided tendency to use uncontracted endings in other forms of the perfect tenses in which contraction is possible (§35. b).

§45. *-ĕrunt* : The ending *-ĕrunt* is rare both in Plautus and in Terence. Only eight examples can be established in Plautus and one in Terence. Three of these are endings of *-āv-* perfects for which only two *-ērunt* endings occur (including *lavērunt* 141), five of perfects with radical *-ē-*, and one of *merui*.

§46. Accent : The verse ictus falls on the *ē* of *-ērunt* in 78 out of 106 instances in Plautus. The *-ērunt* ending occurs before a final iambic word 22 times in the same author; in every instance, this involves conflict of word accent and verse ictus. However, according to Luchs's Law (§3), there must usually be conflict of accent and ictus before a final iambic word. Conrad[26] finds that there is a decided tendency in Plautus to secure a break in sense at verse ends, (that is, to have the end of a sentence or clause coincide with the verse end). Ordinarily a verb in Latin is placed at the end of the clause, or near the end. The ending *-ērunt* could not be used at the end of a verse which requires an iambic close ; it is only natural that forms in *-ērunt* should be placed immediately before the final iambic word, even though this involves conflict of accent and ictus.

Of six other instances in which the penultimate long vowel of forms in *-ērunt* does not receive the verse ictus, four (Nos. 28, 109, 138, 152) occur in anapaestic meter, in which clash of ictus and accent is

26. F. Conrad : Vers-Ende und Sinnesabschnitt bei Plautus; in Glotta 15.28-44 (1927).

frequent.[27] *Concrépuērúnt forés* 56, at the end of a sentence, is probably analogous to the same phrase at the end of a verse. The *ē* of *abiērunt* 154 may be short, though I have preferred the *-ērunt* ending (§41. c).

There is, therefore, a very decided tendency to accent the *-ērunt* forms in accordance with the penultimate law. Almost all the exceptions are attributable to metrical reasons, and it is not possible to imply that there was any shifting of the accent on these perfect forms in everyday speech.

The accent of forms with elided *-ēr^e^* is interesting : the *ē* of *ēr^e^* fails to have the ictus in 11[28] out of 37 occurrences in Plautus, and in 10[29] out of 22 occurrences in Terence. It does not seem necessary to imply that the elision of the final vowel caused or made possible a shifting of the accent to the preceding syllable. It is more probable that phrases with unaccented *-ēr^e^* (an old perfect ending) were formed at a time[30] when words were not always accented in accordance with the penultimate law.

27. Lindsay ELV 296.
28. Nos. 20, 22, 23, 58, 66, 87, 106, 108, 113, 144 (cf. §9, note 33), 161.
29. Nos. 177 t, 190 t, 194 t, 195 t, 196 t, 203 t, 204 t, 223 t, 225 t, 228 t.
30. Cf. §23.

V. THE RELATION OF THE ENDINGS

A. Problem

§47. The ending *-ēre* is doubtless of Indo-European origin [1]; *-ĕrunt* may have been derived from **-isont* as its origin is usually explained, and the theory that *-ērunt* arose by a contamination of *-ēre* and *-ĕrunt* is possible phonetically. It is not my purpose to review the theories on the development of the sounds in these endings; discussion on this point and further references may be found in Leumann-Stolz, and in Sommer. [2]

§48. My conclusion that *-ēre* and *-ērᵉ* were old forms which were no longer regularly used in colloquial Latin at the time of Plautus and Terence, is quite definitely in agreement with the theory that *-ēre* is of Indo-European origin. But to explain the use of *-ērunt* and *-ĕrunt* in Plautus and Terence on the usual theory that *-ĕrunt* is an older form than *-ērunt*, is, in my opinion, quite impossible.

§49. If Plautus had been free to choose between *-ērunt* and *-ĕrunt* on the basis of metrical convenience alone, he would certainly have preferred *-ĕrunt*. A very great majority of the verses in Plautus are composed in meters that require an iambic close: most often either iambic senarii or trochaic septenarii. This seems to be the only requirement which is likely to have affected the poet's use of particular forms to any extent (§6). In four plays of Plautus, 23 out of 26 *-āvĕr-* and *-ōvĕr-* forms of the perfect tenses are used at verse ends (§35. b); these are greatly preferred to the contracted forms (used 6 times in the same plays) which have long penults, but Terence prefers

1. The origin of *-ēre* cannot be explained from any Latin form and must therefore be considered to be primitive.

2. Leumann-Stolz, §246; Sommer, 578.

those with contraction. The preference of Plautus is here very decidedly for the longer forms which have short penults. Conrad [3] has shown that forms which are unusual in later Latin, especially those which are either colloquial or archaic, are practically confined to verse ends: the present infinitive passive in *-ier* is used 168 times at the ends of verses, at iambic diaereses 6 times; *extemplo* 58 times within the verse, the anaptyptic form *extempulo* 6 times at the end; the form in *-ārius*, which Plautus uses much more often than it is used later, occurs at verse ends over a hundred times, within the verse only twenty times. All these words, and others mentioned by Conrad, have short penults. Conrad believes that these forms were used, not primarily for metrical reasons, but to secure pauses at verse ends, to make each verse a unity in itself. This explanation, too, would lead one to expect to find *-ĕrunt* at the end of the verse more often. The usual position of a verb in Latin is at the end of a sentence or clause; a glance at practically any page of Plautus will reveal that the poet had no objection whatever to using at the end of a verse any verb form which the meter permitted. The ending *-ērunt* could not be used at the ends of most verses because of the quantity of its penult (cf. §46). All this evidence points very decidedly to the fact that if Plautus had been guided in his use of *-ērunt* (106 times) and *-ĕrunt* (8 times) by the requirements of composition, he would certainly have used the latter ending more often than he did.

§50. *-ērunt* must be taken as the regular ending of the third plural perfect at the time of Plautus; and *-ĕrunt*, since it is so rarely used, though metrically desirable, must be considered as an unusual ending at that time. There is no reason whatever to believe that *-ĕrunt* was used to any extent either in colloquial or in formal language. If *-ĕrunt* was used to any extent in colloquial language, Plautus could hardly have had any objection to the use of the form, since his use of *-ēre* shows that he rather avoided non-colloquial forms except in utterance of non-colloquial style. If *-ĕrunt* was an old form current in formal language, we should expect to find *-ĕrunt* used more often by Terence, who frequently used the old forms in *-ēre*; yet he used *-ĕrunt* only once. If *-ĕrunt* was an older ending than *-ērunt*, *-ĕrunt* must on this showing have practically disappeared before the time

3. F. Conrad: Vers-Ende und Sinnesabschnitt bei Plautus; in Glotta 15.28-44 (1927).

of Plautus and Terence. It is difficult to understand why the supposedly older ending *-ĕrunt*, existing beside similar endings of perfect tenses in *-ĕrō*, *-ĕram*, etc., should have been almost completely displaced in the primitive period by a new ending *-ērunt* (and, for that matter, by *-ēre* and *-ēr'* also) whose *ē* is not found in any other ending of the paradigm.

§51. Thus, the relation of *-ērunt* and *-ĕrunt* in Plautus and Terence cannot be explained by means of the previously accepted theory of the origin of the endings. The purpose of this chapter is to show: that *-ērunt* was developed analogically from the old form in *-ēre*; that contracted forms of the third plural perfect were originally developed from the forms in *-ērunt*; that *-ĕrunt* was developed during or shortly before the lifetime of Plautus, from the contracted forms by analogy with other forms of the perfect tenses ending in *-ĕrant* etc.[4] This theory of the relation of the endings will make possible a consistent explanation of the usages in Plautus and in Terence, and also makes easy their history in later times (§66–§85).

B. The Origin of *-ērunt*, *-ārunt*, *-ĕrunt*

§52. The ending *-ērunt*: The possibility of the development of *-ēre* to *-ērunt* 'mittels des normalen *-ont*' is mentioned by Sommer.[5] An analogical change from *-ēre* to *-ērunt* (earlier *-ēront*) on the basis of present indicative forms like *dicunt* (*-ont*) is quite possible. There is a constant tendency in language to regularize inflections, and change in forms is frequently conditioned by this tendency. Thus the primary ending *-t* of the third person singular was generalized for all forms of the third person singular active in Latin; the primitive secondary ending would become *-d* in Latin (cf. Old Latin FECED and SIED in the Duenos inscription, CIL I². 4; FECED CIL I². 2437; FECID CIL I².

4. E. Vetter, in Glotta 14.26 note 2 (1925), seems to suggest that *-ērunt* and *-ĕrunt* should be explained as separate developments in Latin, because of Faliscan F[if]IQOD CIE 8079: 'zeigt dasz das lat. *-ēre*, *-ērunt*, *-ĕrunt*, junge lateinische Sonderentwicklung ist, was ja wohl zu erwarten war'. Herbig, Indogermanische Forschungen 32.77 (1913), explains *fifiqod* as an aorist (as Leumann-Stolz, §246, takes the Oscan-Umbrian perfect ending *-ens*). Vetter thinks that *-od* is also quite distinct from *-ens*, and apparently takes *fifiqod* to be developed from an original perfect form.

5. 578.

561) by regular phonetic development; *honos* became *honor* by analogy with other forms of the paradigm in which intervocalic *-s-* regularly became *-r-* in Latin by rhotacism. The change from *-ēre* to *-ērunt* (*-ēront*) could readily have been brought about by analogy ; a change like that of *dixēre* to *dixēr-unt* on the basis of **-unt* in *dicunt* is not unparalleled : *iter, itineris* (for older *iter, *itinis*), and *jecur, jecinoris* (for **jequinis*) [6], are examples of analogies which are not strictly proportional. The old ending *-e* of *-ēre* was unlike any other third plural ending in Latin, and would have been apt to be replaced by the more common ending *-unt* (or *-ont*).

§53. Contracted forms in *-ārunt* etc. : The comparatively frequen occurrence in Plautus and Terence of forms with the ending *-ārunt* (and *-ōrunt*) does not necessarily imply the existence of an older ending *-āvĕrunt*. The principle that *-āvĕ-* could be contracted to *-ā-* is not generally accepted. [7] Most authorities accept only one regular phonetic rule for contraction in the *-v-* perfect forms : *-v-* was lost between like vowels and the vowels were contracted ; e. g. *audīvistis* became *audīstis, consvēveram* became *consvēram*. All apparent contractions not covered by this rule are to be explained by analogy. Whether the *e* of *-erunt* after *-v-* was long or short, made therefore no difference so far as the possibility of contraction is concerned ; presumably, *decrērunt* could come from *decrēvērunt* as well as from *decrēvĕrunt*. Since I assume that the perfect ending *-ĕrunt* did not exist at the time when contraction of third plural perfects first took place, I take *decrērunt* to be developed from *decrēvērunt*, and by analogy with forms like *decrērunt, invocārunt* from *invocāvērunt*. Forms in *-ōrunt* and probably *dormīrunt* (No. 110) were developed in the same way. As has been pointed out (§35. a-§35. b), Plautus frequently used contracted forms in the third plural perfect indicative of *-āv-* perfects (and apparently of *-ōv-* perfects) : 54°/₀ of the total. But (in four plays) he decidedly preferred the uncontracted *-āvĕr-* (and *-ōvĕr-*) forms in the other tenses of the perfect : contracted forms are only 16°/₀ of the total. Since *-ārunt* presumably comes from *-āvērunt* this distinction can readily be understood : there was not as great a tendency in colloquial Latin

6. Leumann-Stolz. §176. I.B.

7. Leumann-Stolz, §244.1.b ; Sommer, 562-3. It might, however, be maintained that *amā-runt* is formed directly after the model of *fecē-runt*. Similarly, *fecis-ti (s)* may have had some influence on the formation of *amās-ti(s)*, and perhaps even on that of *dormīs-ti(s)*.

to contract *-āvĕr-* to *-ār-* as there was to contract *-āvērunt* to *-ārunt*. In the case of *-āvĕr-* and *-ār-*, the existence of *-āvĕr-* with various personal endings probably resisted the tendency to contraction. However, there were no other forms in *-āvēr-* which might have tended to hold the ending *-ērunt*. As in the change from *-ēre* to *-ērunt*, so in the change from *-āvērunt* to *-ārunt* (as contrasted with a less decided tendency to change *-āvĕr-* to *-ār-*), it is the unusual 'irregular' ending (*-ērunt*) that tends to disappear, and to be replaced by a form similar to other forms which already existed: there is more similarity between *-ārunt* and *-ārant*, *-ārint*, etc., than there is between *-āvḗrunt* and *-ā́vĕrant*, *-ā́vĕrint*, etc.

§54. The ending *-ĕrunt*: There have been no attempts to explain *-ĕrunt* as the latest of the perfect endings in origin, since the time when the principles of Latin phonetics were less definitely established. Corssen [8], chiefly on the basis of forms in inscriptions from Pisaurum (which will be discussed in §57), believed that *-ĕrunt* was of dialectal origin, that the *ē* of *-ērunt* was shortened under the influence of an accent on the preceding (initial) syllable. We have no further evidence that *-ĕrunt* was a dialectal form, or that it was ever so regarded in ancient times, nor is there reasonable justification for an assumption that long vowels in medial syllables were shortened even in a country dialect, because of the Primitive Italic stress accent on the initial syllable. [9]

Osthoff [10], also believing that *-ĕrunt* was the latest of the perfect endings, derived it from **vīdĭrunt* by analogy with *vidĭmus*, *vidĭstis*, etc. The *ĭ* before *-r-*, according to Osthoff, then became *ĕ* as in *sĕro* from **sĭro*. This phonetic explanation is improbable, since there are words with *-ĭr-* plus a vowel in Latin (*vĭreo*, *vĭri*) in which the change to *-ĕr-* did not occur. The usual explanation of forms with *ĕ* from original *ĭ* before *r* plus a vowel is that the *-r-* comes from intervocalic *-s-* which was rhotacized, and that *-ĭ-* became *-ĕ-* at some stage in the process of rhotacism of the following *-s-*. [11]

8. W. Corssen: Über Aussprache, Vokalismus, und Betonung der Lateinischen Sprache 1^2. 611-3; Leipzig, 1868.

9. There is no evidence in Latin that long vowels were shortened for this reason; cf. Leumann-Stolz, §31.

10. H. Osthoff: Zur Geschichte des Perfekts 213-4; Strassburg, 1884.

11. Leumann-Stolz, §27. b.

§55. Lindsay [12] noticed that *-ĕrunt* (' from **-esont*, or **-isont* ') seems to have been a pronunciation of colloquial Latin that won its way only gradually into Latin literature. I agree that *-ĕrunt* was a pronunciation of colloquial Latin, though I fail to see any evidence that *-ĕrunt* ever won its way into Latin literature to any extent (§66-§85). Nor do I believe that it was developed from **-isont* or from **-esont* (the former is more probable if *-ĕrunt* was an old form). [13] Intervocalic *-s-* became *-r-* in very early Latin, at a time when phonetic or morphological change could not have been retarded by any distinction between colloquial language and any other type of speech. [14] Though *-ĕrunt* may have come from **-isont* by regular phonetic change, there is no reason to believe that the spread of any form was checked in primitive times because it was 'colloquial', as *-ĕrunt* must have been checked (cf. §50) if Lindsay's explanation is correct.

§56. The ending *-ĕrunt* actually was, in my opinion, confined to colloquial speech at the time of Plautus and was the last of the third plural perfect endings to be evolved in Latin. *-ārunt* was a common ending (§35.a) of *-āv-* perfects at the time of Plautus and Terence. The uncontracted forms of the other perfect tenses, such as *-āvĕrant*, seem to have been much more frequent than the contracted forms in colloquial language at the time of Plautus (§35. b). However, forms of the contracted type *-ārant* did exist at the time, even though they were less frequent than the longer forms of the type *-āvĕrant*. It is precisely this greater tendency to use the longer forms such as *-āvĕrant*, which may have provided the conditions most suitable for the origin of the ending *-ĕrunt*. The ending *-ārunt* was presumably associated with *-ārant*, and *-ārant* was frequently used in the longer form *-āvĕrant* ; nothing is more natural than that *-āvĕrunt* should begin to be used instead of *-ārunt*, just as *-ārant* and *-āvĕrant* were interchangeable. The change to *-ĕrunt* is again in the direction of the more common forms of the paradigm in *-ĕrō*, *-ĕram*, *-ĕrim*, etc., as were the changes from *-ēre* to *-ērunt*, and from *-āvērunt* to *-ārunt* (§52 and §53).

12. W. M. Lindsay : The Latin Language 531-2 ; Oxford, 1894.

13. Leumann-Stolz, §246.

14. According to Leumann-Stolz, §128, the change to *r* was probably completed about the middle of the fourth century B.C. It need not be assumed that conservative expressions of ritualistic and formulaic character prevented the spread of *-ĕrunt* forms in colloquial Latin.

§57. An important objection to the assumption that *-ĕrunt* originated during the lifetime of Plautus, or shortly before, is the existence of DEDRO CIL 1².379, DEDROT CIL 1².378, in inscriptions from Pisaurum; DEDRON CIL 1².30 from Rome. Only short vowels were lost in pronunciation because of the Primitive Italic stress accent. However, these epigraphic forms do not prevent the assumption that at the time when the inscriptions were made, the third person plural of *dedi* was always pronounced with three syllables, and that the vowel in the medial syllable was long and was always pronounced long (*dedēront*) [15]; and that the ending *-ĕrunt* was not then in existence. The *-dr-* is in each instance probably a graphic representation for *der-*. In Praenestine inscriptions, a letter of the alphabet sometimes represents its name. [16] The following epigraphic forms are illustrative of such writing: DCUMIUS (for *Dĕcumius*) CIL 1².1445, CIL 14.2855; PTRONIO (for *Pĕtronio*) CIL 1².239; TRTIA (for *Tĕrtia*) CIL 14.3251; LUBS (for *lubēns*) CIL 1².388, CIL 14.2892. Terentius Scaurus [17] mentions the same phenomenon as a feature of ancient writing and gives as examples: *dcimus* for *dĕcimus*, *bne* for *bĕne*, *cra* for *cēra*, *krus* for *cārus*. Since B apparently represents both *bĕ* (*bne*) and *bē* (LUBS), I assume that D could represent *dē* (in DEDRO etc.) as well as *dĕ* (in *dcimus* and DCUMIUS). Therefore, the three epigraphic forms mentioned above do not necessarily prove that the perfect ending *-ĕrunt* existed before the time of Plautus, nor that *-ĕrunt* is of dialectal origin.

C. SUMMARY

§58. Previous explanations of the origin of *-ērunt* and *-ĕrunt* are not necessarily excluded by the theory presented in §52 to §57, but they seem to be quite unlikely because of the usage in Plautus and Terence (§49 to §51). It cannot be said with absolute certainty that *-ĕrunt* was not derived from earlier *-*isont* and that *-ērunt* was not developed by a contamination of *-ēre* and *-ĕrunt* (if *-ĕrunt* was derived from *-*isont*). However, the usages in Plautus and in Terence lend

15. For the loss of *-t* and *-n-*, cf. Leumann-Stolz, §246.
16. This method of writing may have originated with the Etruscans. Cf. M. Hammarström, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Etruskischen, Lateinischen, und Griechischen Alphabets 15-20, 31-4; Helsingfors, 1920.
17. 7.14.15-15.7 K.

fairly definite support to the theory that *-ĕrunt* was the last of the third plural perfect endings to be developed, and that this ending originated in the colloquial Latin spoken in Rome, during or shortly before the lifetime of Plautus.

§59. The ending *-ērunt* is found 106 times in Plautus, 22 times in Terence; *-ĕrunt* 8 times in Plautus, once in Terence.

The form in *-ā'vērunt* is used twice in Plautus, in both instances with the accent on the antepenult; the contracted form in *-ārunt* is used 6 times in Plautus, 3 times in Terence; *-āvĕrunt* 3 times in Plautus. The fact that the form in *-āvē'runt* is not used by either author with the accent on the antepenult, may or may not be accidental.[18] Since the ending *-ērunt* was still so decidedly prevalent in Plautus as a whole, it can be expected that *-ērunt* had not been completely displaced by *-ĕrunt* in any type of word; in other words, even if *-ārunt* and *-āvĕrunt* had become the usual endings for words of this type, we can still expect to find *-āvērunt*. The comparatively frequent occurrence of the form in *-ārunt* in both Plautus and Terence, shows that *-ārunt* must have been in common use at that time. This fact is quite essential to the theory that *-ĕrunt* developed from the contracted forms, since it is improbable that a new form would develop by analogy from another form which was rarely used. Finally, *-āvĕrunt* is used 3 times in Plautus and *-āvērunt* twice, as compared with a total of 8 occurrences of *-ĕrunt* and 106 occurrences of *-ērunt* in all types of verbs. These statistics seem to support my belief that *-ĕrunt* actually originated in the *-āv-* perfects.

§60. All except one of the remaining *-ĕrunt* endings are found with verbs which have radical *-ē-* in the perfect stem. For perfects of the type *fēci*, the ending *-ērunt* is used 19 times in Plautus, *-ĕrunt* 4 times; *-ērunt* 3 times in Terence, *-ĕrunt* once. *Emĕrunt* 198 t is the only perfect form with this ending in Terence, as compared with a total (all types of verbs) of 22 forms in *-ērunt*.

After the perfect in *-ĕrunt* had originated in a form such as *locāvĕrunt* 107, this ending could spread to other types of words by direct analogy with any other uncontracted forms of the perfect tenses, aided by the fact that so many forms of the perfect tenses in *-ĕr-* plus personal

18. Cf. §35. There are too few examples to support an assumption that Plautus avoided *-āvē'runt*, but it seems significant that a form in *-āvē'runt* never occurs.

ending were already in existence. However, it cannot be expected that the new ending would have spread very rapidly at first, nor that all types of words were equally receptive to *-ĕrunt*. There were doubtless characteristics that favored the change from *-ērunt* to *-ĕrunt* in the forms and uses of some words or types of words; characteristics that resisted the change in other words or types of words.

Since perfects of the type *feci* seem, according to the statistics given above, to have been the first words to acquire the new ending *-ĕrunt* from the *-āv-* perfects, dissimilation may have favored the change from *fēcērunt* to *fecĕrunt*. I wish to make it clear, however, that I do not believe that the desire to avoid *-ē-* in two successive syllables was a cause of the change; it is merely assumed that this was probably a contributory factor. Only the analogy with a third plural perfect form in *-ĕrunt* could make the change from *fēcērunt* to *fēcĕrunt* possible.

§61. *Meruĕrunt* 103 is the only other third plural perfect in *-ĕrunt* which is at all certain; this is the only instance of *mereo* in a third plural perfect form. The ending *-ĕrunt* makes the form a quadrisyllable beginning with three short syllables, and it has been noticed (§41.a) that perfects of this type regularly have the ictus on the first syllable in Plautus. Perhaps this characteristic favored the change from *meruḗrunt* to *méruĕrunt*. Since, in the 33 words of this type, there is only one clear example of the ending *-ĕrunt*, I have preferred to adopt *ábiērúnt* 154, though *ábiĕrúnt* is metrically possible (§41.c).

§62. The fact that *-ĕrunt* is a rare ending should be considered in the determination of the quantity of the *e* of *-erunt* in instances in which more than one scansion is possible. I am inclined to doubt that a form such as *excidĕrunt* had replaced *éxcidḗrunt* while *-ĕrunt* was still a very rare perfect ending, if there was any rhythmic tendency in the language at all.[19] On the same basis, I hesitate to scan *fuĕrunt* and *dedĕrunt*, and can see no good reason for believing that the ending *-ĕrunt* existed in words whose perfect stem consists of a single short syllable or ends in a short syllable preceded by a long syllable (§39 to §40.b). But it is not possible to say definitely that a new ending *-ĕrunt* could not be used in the third plural perfect of any verb, at least

19. Cf. §6, and §23.

occasionally, at any time after *-ĕrunt* had originated as a perfect ending.[20]

§63. Since the nine examples of *-ĕrunt* in Plautus and Terence occur only in a few types of words which seem to present conditions most suitable for the origin and spread of this ending, it is my opinion that *-ĕrunt* could not have originated long before the birth of Plautus, if not actually during his lifetime. The perfect form in *-ĕrunt* is similar to forms in *-ĕr-* plus personal ending throughout the pluperfect and future perfect indicative, and the perfect subjunctive ; but *-ērunt* is not similar to any other ending. So long as the natural tendencies of colloquial language were not restricted by an established literature or by formal education, it is hardly conceivable that an ending so decidedly in the direction of inflectional regularity could have been in existence very long without being used in more types of words : for example, in the common *-s-* perfects (§38 ; cf. §78-§80).

§64. Terence, who was not apt to follow colloquial usage in adopting new forms, used *-ĕrunt* only once. His failure to use this metrically desirable form more often is consistent with his avoidance of the second singular passive in *-ris* : he used the old ending *-re* 56 times, but never used the new ending *-ris* : Plautus used *-re* 205 times *-ris* 25 times.[21] Thus, the usage of Terence helps to establish the fact that *-ĕrunt* was an ending which was strictly colloquial, and which was not used in conservative speech at that time.

§65. Plautus practically always used *-ēre* and *-ēr^e^* as these forms were probably used in colloquial speech (§17 to §28); if my explanation of the origin and early development of *-ĕrunt* is correct, then Plautus must also have used this ending as it was used in colloquial Latin at that time, and in no other way. It is therefore my belief that Plautus used the various endings of the third plural perfect exactly as they were being used in conversation on the streets[22] of Rome.

20. I object to *dormīĕrunt* for *dormirunt* 110, not primarily because of the ending *-ĕrunt*, but also because of the preceding *-ī-* ; cf. §36.b.

21. Muller, 335-6 (with references). There may be one *-ris* form in Terence, Hecyra 317 ; this is discussed by Muller, 340. note 1.

22. I am not nclined to agree with Lindsay (ELV 13) that Plautus aimed at

reproducing the tones of 'everyday (educated) speech'. There seems to be no basis for assuming that Plautus was aware of any distinction such as that implied by the term 'educated'. Presumably the only notable distinctions in the speech at Rome in the time of Plautus were those attributable to dialectic influences, or to formal language of conservative or archaic character (as illustrated in the use of *-ēre*, §17- §21). A language may be quite regular, with few linguistic changes in progress at a given time, before there is any grammar or formal education in the language. The Sanskrit in the Rig-Veda, the Greek of Homer, and the English of Chaucer, are all essentially regular, but it is hardly conceivable that grammars or formal education in those languages ever existed before those works were written. I should therefore prefer to characterize the language of Plautus as 'normal' colloquia Latin.

VI. THE USE OF THE ENDINGS IN LATER TIMES

§66. The oldest of the perfect endings, *-ēre,* which was presumably used in archaic documents of legal and religious character, had lasted long enough to justify its continued existence in Latin literature, though under limited conditions. The newest ending, *-ĕrunt*, which was being developed in the colloquial language while Latin literature was in its infancy, had not developed far enough to secure recognition as a regular ending in the Latin of the educated, at the time when the language became more or less fixed and when natural linguistic change was retarded. The form in *-ērunt* apparently prevailed in the speech of the educated Roman throughout the classical period. In the Latin spoken by his illiterate contemporaries, however, *-ĕrunt* presumably continued to spread, though perhaps retarded by the indirect influence of education and of literature. The one outstanding fact which we know to be certain, is that *-ĕrunt* (and the contracted forms) alone survived in the Romance languages [1]; in them there is not a trace of *-ēre* or of *-ērunt*. This final stage in the history of the perfect endings in Latin cannot satisfactorily be explained on the basis of the generally accepted theory that *-ĕrunt* is older in origin than *-ērunt*. On that basis, it would be necessary to assume that the ending *-ĕrunt* had been practically displaced by *-ērunt* in colloquial Latin before a literature had been developed (§55), but that later the process was reversed and that *-ērunt* was displaced by *-ĕrunt* in spite of the influence of the literature. Such a reversal may be possible, but it seems highly improbable. However, it does seem quite reasonable to believe that *-ĕrunt*, as the newest of the endings, continued to develop in Vulgar Latin, and eventually displaced *-ēre* and *-ērunt* entirely.

§67. The preceding paragraph indicates, in a general way, the

1. W. Meyer-Lübke : Grammatik der Romanischen Sprachen 2.299 ; Leipzig, 1894.

manner in which the later history of the perfect endings my be explained on the basis of the theory which I have developed from the usage in Plautus and Terence. More detailed suggestions, and some of the facts on which these suggestions are based, are given in the remainder of this chapter. Muller's recent article [2] on the use of *-ēre*, *-ērunt*, and *-ĕrunt,* seems to gather all previously ascertained information, and to add much that is new. Though I have seen only the first installment of this article, I am inclined to believe that Muller over-emphasizes the extent to which the use of the endings was conditioned by stylistic influences. However, he does not neglect other factors, such as the influence of metrical requirements, and he is painstakingly accurate even to the most minute detail. I differ with him only on points of emphasis, and I am indebted to his article both for data which I have used and for many details of interpretation. I have consulted other less extensive articles for details which have not yet appeared in Muller's article. The work of Hagendahl on the use of *-ēre* and *-ērunt* in Late Latin prose [3], has not been at my disposal, though the review by Baehrens [4] seems not only to indicate Hagendahl's essential conclusions, but also to furnish some additional information.

§68. At the very time when the comedies of Plautus were being written in colloquial Latin, Ennius was laying the foundations of the later literature in works of more formal, non-colloquial character. His tragedies, satires, and epic were much more in accord with the spirit of Rome, the ruler of the world, than were the comedies of his contemporaries. The free-flowing iambic and trochaic meters which were so well suited to popular poetry, were destined to be replaced by the dignified and stately dactylic hexameter, the national meter of Rome. It was Ennius who was truly the father of Roman literature ; his name was revered, and his Annals were quoted for centuries after his death. It is my belief that the Annals of Ennius and the dactylic meter in which they were composed, were more responsible for the continuance of the old perfect ending *-ēre* in Latin literature than any other single factor. [5]

2. 340-89.

3. H. Hagendahl : Die Perfektformen auf *-ere* und *-erunt* (ein Beitrag zur Technik der spätlateinischen Kunstprosa) ; Uppsala, 1923.

4. W. Baehrens, Philologische Wochenschrift 44.702-5 (1924).

5. Cf. E. Wölfflin, Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik 22.166

*****

§69. The use of *-ēre* in the formal language of tragedy and epic is quite definitely indicated by the usage in Plautus (§19-§20). Presumably, the sources which Ennius used, such as the pontifical Annales Maximi, were written in archaic language and were thus at least partly responsible for the use of *-ēre* forms in the historical epic. This is not demonstrable, since we do not possess those sources, and we have only fragments of the works of Ennius himself. But there can be no doubt that he deliberately adopted old forms which were to him characteristic of the language of an earlier period, and of legal diction in his time, and which were therefore very well suited to heroic themes.

However there was also a very practical metrical reason for the use of *-ēre* in the composition of dactylic verse. Many Latin words had lost short vowels in medial and final syllables because of the Primitive Italic stress accent on the initial syllable. The resulting scarcity of short syllables made it difficult for the Latin poet to preserve the dactylic (– ◡◡) character of the Greek hexameter. The *-ēre* ending must have been especially useful in helping to overcome this difficulty, since the two syllables of this ending (– ◡) could be combined with an initial short syllable of the following word (short vowels in initial syllables had remained, since the initial syllable was accented in Primitive Italic) to form a pure dactyl. It should be mentioned also that the variation between the endings *-ērunt* and *-ēre* [6] with final *-e* elided, was doubtless metrically convenient.

§70. According to the figures given by Muller [7], who relies upon the statistics of Steele [8], there are 2183 examples of *-ēre* in various works in the dactylic hexameter, as compared with 557 examples of *-ĕ̄runt* ; the *-ēre* endings comprise 80 °/₀ of the total. Muller points out that there is a distinction in the use of the endings in various types of dactylic poetry. For my purposes, it will be sufficient to indicate the difference between the Aeneid of Vergil and the Satires of Horace and Juvenal in this respect. The percentages in the third column

(1902) : Die Endung *-ēre* ist nicht vulgär, sondern sie wurde von den Epikern metri causa begünstigt, und floss durch Ennius den Historikern zu.

6. Except in the sections which deal with the usage in Phaedrus (§79-§82), *-ēre* will indicate both the elided and unelided forms of the ending throughout this chapter.

7. 354-61, 363-8.

8. R. B. Steele : The Endings *-ere* and *-erunt* in Dactylic Hexameter ; American Journal of Philology 32.328-32 (1911).

show the ratio between the *-ērunt* forms and the *-ēre* forms in each work :

	-ĕ̄runt	*-ēre*	R in °/₀
Aeneid	29	231	12
Satires of Horace	11	17	65
Satires of Juvenal	21	13	161

The ending *-ēre* is used more frequently in those works which tend to use archaic and formal language, less frequently in those works which tend to be more colloquial in style. However, the metrical convenience of the *-ēre* ending must be considered largely responsible for the use of forms with this ending in any dactylic work. Thus there is some indication in the above statistics that *-ēre* was an old ending which was avoided in the colloquial language.

§71. A short time after the Annals of Ennius appeared, the writing of Roman history in Latin prose was also begun. Again the sources as well as the lofty character of the theme must have had an influence on the language used. Cato did not use the ending *-ēre* in his De Agricultura, but seems to have used *-ēre* much more often than *-erunt* in the Origines. [9] Sallust shows a decided preference for the forms in *-ēre*. [10] The usages in Livy and in Tacitus are the most definite and illuminating ; Livy [11] uses *-ēre* very often in the first books of his history, less often as he deals with events which occurred closer to his own times. The ending *-ēre* is used in 56 °/₀ of all the occurrences of third plural perfect endings in the first decade, only 10 °/₀ in the fifth decade ; *-ēre* comprises 73 °/₀ of the total in Book 2, 77 °/₀ in Book 3, only 3 °/₀ in Book 42. Presumably, Livy uses *-ēre* in his early books to give them an archaic, epic flavor. For Tacitus, only the relation between *-ēre* and *-erunt* has been compared [12] : *-ēre* is never found in the Dialogus, is found in 42.1 °/₀ of occurrences of *-ēre* and *-erunt* in the Germania, 73.6 °/₀ in the Agricola, 91.4 °/₀ in the Histories, 91.3 °/₀ in the Annals ; for example, in Book 12 of the Annals, *-ēre* occurs 42 times, *-erunt* once. It cannot be a mere acci-

9. The *-ēre* ending is frequent in a quotation given by Gellius 3.7.19 ; further details are given by Muller, 346-8.

10. Muller, 349-54.

11. Muller, 377-89, uses the statistics of E. B. Lease : Livy's Use of *-arunt*, *-erunt*, and *-ere* ; American Journal of Philology 24.408-22 (1903).

12. Muller, 381-2.

dent that *-ēre* always occurs most frequently in those works or parts of works in which we may expect to find archaic or heroic language. The Romans must have looked upon *-ēre* as an ending characteristic of formal diction.

§72. Caesar avoided the *-ēre* ending : there are only two instances in which *-ēre* is well attested in the manuscripts (BC 1.51.5; 3.63.6).[13] The writers of the remainder of the Corpus Caesarianum also avoided the forms in *-ēre*. In the Bellum Africanum *-erunt* is found 46 times, *-ēre* twice ; in the Bellum Hispaniense *-erunt* 82 times, *-ēre* twice.[14]

Cicero not only avoided the *-ēre* ending (as in Caesar, there are few well attested examples[15] : Ep. ad Fam. 10.19.2 ; Leg. 1.6 ; in Pis. 96), but actually states[16] that he considers *-erunt* the more correct form, though he finds no fault with *-ēre*, and admits that *-ēre* produces an effect that is pleasing to the ear.

Vitruvius never used *-ēre*[17] ; Petronius used *-erunt* 86 times, *-ēre* 13 times.[18] The fact that Petronius, whose language tends to be decidedly colloquial, used *-ēre* at all, has been at least partly explained. Löfstedt[19] and others have shown that *-ēre* was apparently used by Petronius and by later writers, chiefly to secure a rhythmic effect in clausulae : Petr. 33.4 *divisēre convivis* (–́⏑ | –́–́–), ibid. *accessēre continuo*.

§73. Klussmann[20] remarked that Fronto used *-ēre* only when he

13. Sommer, 580 ; Muller, 376-7.

14. Muller, 376-7.

15. Sommer, 580.

16. Orator 47.157 ; writing of verba plena et imminuta : Nec vero reprehenderim '*scripsere* alii rem' [et] *scripserunt* esse verius sentio, sed consuetudini auribus indulgenti libenter obsequor. Cf. Brutus 19.76, about Ennius : '*Scripsere*,' inquit, 'alii rem vorsibus' — et luculente quidem *scripserunt*, etiam si minus quam tu polite. Cicero himself uses *scripserunt*, immediately after quoting the form in *-ēre* from Ennius.

17. E. Löfstedt : Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae 36-9 ; Uppsala, 1911.

18. E. Wölfflin, Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik 14.478 (1906).

19. Op.cit. 39 ; W. Baehrens, Phil. Woch. 24.702-5, with special reference to Hagendahl (cf. note 3).

20. R. Klussmann : Emendationes Frontoniae 77 ; Berlin, 1874.

tried to use formal language, particularly when speaking 'ex cathedra', but that Marcus Aurelius always used *-erunt*.

In Late Latin literature, there is a constant tendency to avoid the use of *-ēre* in works which tend to be colloquial in style (*-ēre* is never found in the Peregrinatio Aetheriae [21]), and *-ēre* seems to have been used in Late prose chiefly for rhythmic purposes, as indicated above for Petronius. As to the Christian writers, Baehrens [22] says that Minucius used only the ending *-erunt*, and that Christian writers seem to have adopted the *-ēre* form only gradually ; that Tertullian did not always use *-ēre* to form rhythmic clausulae, but used this ending only in parts of his work which show a poetic and polished style in other respects also.

§74. The articles referred to, in the notes to §69-§73, present a great deal of information, of which the above excerpts are only illustrative. I have found nothing to prevent the conclusion that *-ēre* remained strange to everyday speech, of the educated and of the uneducated, throughout the historical period, except in so far as this ending may have been used by individuals or by certain groups in mockery, imitation, or affectation of archaic, elevated, or artificially polished language.

§75. It is not possible to determine precisely to what extent *-erunt* was pronounced with long *e* and to what extent with short *e*, between the time of Plautus and Terence and the beginning of the Romanic languages. We can be sure of the quantity of the vowel in quantitative poetry only. In dactylic verse, in which most Latin poetry was written, the use of *-ērunt* and *-ĕrunt* was very strictly regulated by the quantitative requirements. Forms whose perfect stem ends in a long vowel could not be used in this type of verse with the ending *-ĕrunt*, *fēcĕrunt* (– ⏑ –) was impossible ; but *perdidĕrunt* (– ⏑⏑ –) could not be used with any ending except *-ĕrunt*; *statuĕrunt* (⏑⏑⏑ –) and *constituĕrunt* (– ⏑⏑⏑ –) were impossible ; the quantity of the *e* in the penultimate syllable of *dedē̆runt* (⏑ ⏑ –) was regulated by the quantity of the final syllable of the preceding word. The dactylic poet had practically no choice between the two endings, and the

21. Löfstedt, op. cit. 36.
22. Op. cit. 705.

usage in dactylic poetry therefore gives us no clue whatever concerning the pronunciation of the *e* of *-erunt*, in actual conversational speech.

§76. Statements by Cicero [23] and by Quintilian [24] throw some light upon the quantity of the *e* of *-erunt* during the classical period, in the language of the educated at least. Both these writers refer to *-ēre* as a shortened form of *-ērunt* and make no mention of a pronunciation *-ĕrunt*. These statements do not necessarily imply that *-erunt* was not at that time pronounced with *ĕ* by the uneducated Roman. Presumably the educated Roman regularly pronounced *-erunt* with *ē*; statements by later grammarians which point to the same conclusion even more definitely, will be mentioned in another connection (§83). The conclusion that *-ērunt* continued to be the standard third plural perfect ending in the speech of the educated is quite consistent with the conclusions reached from the usages in Plautus and in Terence; the ending *-ērunt* prevailed at the time when grammars and schools first fixed the principles of standard usage.

§77. Almost all the Latin poetry which has survived represents the Latin language as it was used by educated people. Though the Satires of Horace and Juvenal show colloquial tendencies, these works primarily represent the speech of educated Romans, and the fact that they were written in the dactylic hexameter regulated the use of *-ērunt* and *-ĕrunt* even if the poets had tried to use forms current in colloquial language. Muller reaches the highly improbable conclusion that some of the Carmina Latina Epigraphica indicate that *-ērunt* continued to be the only third plural perfect ending in colloquial Latin (' solam terminationem *-ērunt* revera viguisse '). [25] Such epigraphic verse was doubtless influenced by the usages of the great Latin poets. Most of the verses which he cites are in dactylic meter, and he himself had previously indicated that the use of *-ērunt* and *-ĕrunt* in this meter was strictly regulated by metrical requirements. [26] Yet even though he takes great pains to point out colloquial characteristics in some of the inscriptions, the fact that *-ērunt* was used in the same

23. Cf. note 16.

24. Inst. Or. 1.5.42 : Quanquam *fuerunt*, qui nobis quoque adicerent dualem '*scripsere*', '*legere*' ; quod evitandae asperitatis gratia mollitum est, ut apud veteres pro ' male mereris ', 'male merere '.

25. 368-74 ; the conclusion mentioned here appears on page 373.

26. 354-6.

inscriptions does not prove that the uneducated Roman always pronounced *-erunt* with *e* in ordinary conversation. It is inconceivable to me that any Roman, when composing tomb inscriptions in verse, would not try to use the most elevated style at his command. But even if someone were to find among the wall-scribblings in Pompeii a dozen iambic or trochaic verses containing perfect forms in *-ĕrunt* along with obvious colloquialisms, this would not prove that *-ĕrunt* was always used by the uneducated Roman. Unless we know something about the composer and the circumstances under which the verses were written, the presumption that the versifier was influenced by more formal poetry would be too strong to justify the inference that the same man might not have pronounced *-erunt* with short *e* in everyday talk.

§78. However, there is some fairly definite evidence that *-ĕrunt* continued to spread in popular speech after the time of Plautus. The following quotation from Suetonius (Julius 80.2) seems to be typically colloquial ; according to the biographer, these verses were frequently heard on the streets a short time before the murder of Caesar :

> Gállos Cáesar ín triúmphum dúcit, íd^em in cúriám ;
> Gálli brácas *déposuē'runt*, látum clávum *súmpsĕrúnt*.

They are trochaic septenarii with perfect coincidence of accent and ictus. Possibly *déposuē'runt* is to be scanned *dépostŭĕrunt* ; I have preferred the former on the basis of the procedure followed for similar words in Plautus (§42). But the use of *-ĕrunt* with the *-s-* perfect is interesting, since Plautus never used the *-ĕrunt* ending with words of this type (§38). The form *sumpsèrunt* therefore suggests that the use of *-ĕrunt* continued to spread in colloquial Latin.

§79. Muller [27] states that Phaedrus, who tended to use colloquial language, and who wrote iambic senarii, used *-ĕrunt* only once. My findings do not agree with this statement. Out of 46 occurrences of third plural perfects in the Fables [28], *-ĕrunt* occurs 8 times : *praebuĕrunt*

27. 337, note 2.
28. I have used the text of A. Brenot (Phèdre, Fables ; in the Assn. Guillaume Budé series ; Paris, 1924). Forms which appear in the so-called 'Appendix' are also included, since the use of the perfect endings in these Fables does not differ from the usage in the poems usually attributed to Phaedrus. With regard to *-erunt* forms

2.4.24, *laesĕrunt* 3.2.19, *inspexĕrunt* 3.8.5, *fuĕrunt* 3. Epil. 24, *coepĕrunt* 4.17.2, *abiĕrunt* 4.21.16, *periĕrunt* 5.4.10, *luĕrunt* App. 13.7. There are four instances of unelided *-ēre* : *fuēre* 1.5.4, App. 11.5; *periēre* 1.20.6, *misēre* 3.2.6 (and perhaps *petiēre* 3.10.39, cf. note 29). Elided forms in *-ēr^e* occur 10 times : *misēr^e ad Jovem* 1.2.22, 4.19.1; *petiēr^e ab Jove* 1.2.11, *sustulēr^e ad sidera* 1.6.4; *coepēr^e* 1.20.5, 2.2.7, 4.19.23; *posuēr^e* 2. Epil. 1, *vidēr^e* 3.2.3, *finxēr^e* 5.8.7. Only the short forms in *-ārunt* are found for *-āv-* perfects, 6 times : 1.9.5, 1.24.6, 2. Epil. 2, 3.10.34, 4.9.11, App. 14.33. The ending *-ērunt*, however, appears more often than any other, 18 instances.[29] There is here more evidence concerning the history of the perfect ending than is directly apparent in the mere statistics.

§80. If we assume that these Fables were actually versions of traditional stories which had been handed down among the common folk from generation to generation, the reason for the use of the various perfect endings become quite obvious. All the evidence available indicates that the form in *-ĕrunt* was not used in the language of the educated, except where it was metrically required. But the usages of Plautus and of Terence show that iambic senarii could be written without employing the ending *-ĕrunt*. Though this ending is found 8 times (out of a total of 175 third plural perfects) in Plautus, the *-ĕrunt* form is almost entirely restricted to *-āv-* and radical *-ē-* perfects (7 times), and Terence used it only once (with a radical *-ē-* perfect).[30] The writers of comedy did not find it necessary to use *-ĕrunt* with the common *-s-* perfects at all. Thus the only reasonable explanation of the *-ĕrunt* forms in Phaedrus is that they were characteristic of everyday colloquial speech. The usage of Phaedrus seems to differ from that of Plautus, since *-ĕrunt* is not found with *-āv-* or radical *-ē-* perfects, but is found with *-s-* perfects and other types. But radical *-ē-* perfects occur only twice (*lēgĕrunt* 3.17.2, *fēcĕrunt* 4.1.7), and the lack of an *-ĕrunt* form may be regarded as accidental. The short form in *-ārunt* is preferred for *-āv-* perfects as

which appear before a final iambic word, and forms of verbs whose perfect stem consists of two short syllables, I have followed the procedure indicated in §3 and §41. a.

29. 1.20.3, 1.24.8, 3. 3. 4, 3.7.4, 3.10.35, 3.10.39 (apud Brenot; *petiere* P, *rogarunt* NV, *petierunt* L. Mueller), 3.17.2, 4.1.7, 4.6.4, 4.19.10, 4.19.33, 4.23.18, 4.26.32, 5. prol. 6, 5.1.16, App. 20.4, App. 28.2, App. 28.3.

30. §35, §37, §41.

in Plautus and in Terence (§35), and perhaps *-āvĕrunt* was no longer used even in colloquial language. This is quite in agreement with the development in the Romanic languages; only the short ('contracted') forms survived.[31] The fact that *-ĕrunt* is found with *-s-* perfects and other types indicates that this ending was no longer restricted to specific types of perfects.

§81. Even the old *-ēre* and *-ēr*ᵉ forms furnish evidence of the colloquial character of these poems. The *-ēre* ending is never metrically required : *-ērunt* could be substituted in every instance. It is worthy of note that *fuēre* and *periēre* comprise three out of the four (or perhaps five) occurrences of *-ēre*. Plautus also used *-ēre* and *-ēr*ᵉ frequently with these words (§39. a and §41. e). *Fuēre* App. 11.5 is used in an obviously boastful speech and is thus comparable to the form in §19. c. Of the *-ēr*ᵉ forms, *coepēr*ᵉ occurs three times, and the meaning of the word indicates that it might have been common in the traditional fable. The first four examples of *-ēr*ᵉ, in the order in which they are given above, occur in phrases which may also be characteristic of old folk-tales. I therefore take the *-ēre* and *-ēr*ᵉ forms in Phaedrus to be archaic survivals in the language of the popular fable.[32]

§82. However, I do not assume that the usage of Phaedrus is approximately that of everyday colloquial speech. Metrical requirements may have had some influence on the use of the perfect endings. It is entirely possible that other poetry with which Phaedrus was acquainted, influenced to some extent his use of the forms. Even if he did attempt to present the stories in virtually the form in which they were current, the fable represents a rather conservative type of colloquial diction. Thus, even though *-ērunt* is found in his Fables more often than *-ĕrunt* (18 to 8), we can by no means be certain that the former was preferred in the ordinary conversation of the uneducated. But the usage in the Fables does show that there was a strong tendency to use *-ĕrunt* in everyday speech as early as the first century of the Christian era.

§83. The form in *-ērunt* was perhaps the prevailing third plural form even in the speech of the uneducated Roman for some time after

31. E. g., Italian *amárono*, French *aimèrent*, from Latin *amā'runt*.
32. Cf. §20, §23.

the death of Plautus. Presumably, however, the tendency to use *-ĕrunt* persisted, and forms with *-ĕ-* were used more and more frequently in spite of the influence of education and literature. The first definite recognition of such a pronunciation appears in the works of Latin grammarians of the third and fourth Christian centuries. Sacerdos in the third century, and Servius in the fourth century, both refer to the shortening of the *ē* of *-ērunt* as an example of 'barbarismus'.[33] They use the perfect form in *-ĕrunt* as the outstanding example of incorrect vowel shortening in pronunciation. The colloquial use of the ending must, therefore, have spread to such an extent that this pronunciation had become a problem with which the schoolmaster had to deal; apparently the use of this ending was no longer confined to the speech of the uneducated classes. But the implication that *-ērunt* had continued to be the standard pronunciation in the speech of educated Romans during the classical period is very definitely supported by these statements.

§84. It is worthy of note that the use of *-ēre* is never criticized as incorrect. Even Cicero[34], who considers *-erunt* (presumably *-ērunt*) to be preferable and practically always uses *-erunt* himself, finds no fault with *-ēre*, but actually finds an excuse for the use of this ending. Quintilian[35] also looks upon the 'shortening' from *-ērunt* to *-ēre* as the result of a desire to avoid harshness. This attitude toward *-ēre* is not surprising when we consider a remark in Quintilian[36], which seems to indicate that *-ēre* was still used in the formulaic language

33. Sacerdos, 6.451.4-6 K : Barbarismus est vitiosa dictio unius verbi, ... per correptionem, *steterunt te* correpta quae longa est. Servius in Donatum, 4.444.25-6 K, in a section entitled 'De Barbarismo' : '*steterunt*que comae et vox faucibus haesit' (Aen. 2.774) pro *steterunt*; media enim syllaba naturaliter produci debuit. The term 'barbarismus' is defined as an error of pronunciation in prose. A deviation from the standard form (i. e., *-ērunt*) in verse is called a 'metaplasmus' : Sacerdos, 6.451.14-6 K : Haec vitia cum dicuntur, barbarismi sunt; .... et cum dicuntur a nobis, vitia sunt; cum a poetis, metaplasmi. Servius in Donatum, 4.444.5-11 : Sed tunc barbarismus, cum in uno Romanae linguae sermone peccamus. Ceterum si peregrina sint verba .... tunc barbarolexis vocatur. Praeterea si in prosa oratione fiat, tunc barbarismus dicitur; si autem in poemate, metaplasmus vocatur....... si soluta est oratio, barbarismum vocaremus. The example given by Servius is therefore a metaplasmus rather than a barbarismus.

34. Cf. note 16.

35. Cf. note 24.

36. Inst. Or. 1.5.43, among other examples of *-ēre* forms : '*dixere*'.... praeco pronuntiet.

of the courts in his day. The form in *-ēre* was not used in everyday speech, but the form in *-ĕrunt* certainly must have been used frequently in the speech of uneducated Romans in the third and fourth Christian centuries.

§85. The forms found in the Romanic languages indicate quite definitely that *-ĕrunt* must have displaced *-ēre* and *-ērunt* in Vulgar Latin. As the Roman state declined, Roman literature and Roman education declined also. Eventually, the voice of the schoolmaster was no longer heard; the development of the Latin language was again unhindered by artificial restrictions. The older endings *-ēre* and *-ērunt* were buried with the literature and the education which had kept them alive for so long a time. The new ending *-ĕrunt*, born just before that literature had its origin, continued to develop in Colloquial and Vulgar Latin, and the direct descendants of *-ĕrunt* (and of the contracted forms) alone survived in the Romanic languages.[37]

37. The following Italian forms illustrate this development: *amdrono* (*amārunt*), *dormírono* (*dormīrunt*), *fúrono* (*fuĕrunt*), *fécero* (*fecĕrunt*), *dissero* (*dixĕrunt*), *ébbero* (*habuĕrunt*.)

INDEX

Numerals which are preceded by ♯ refer to the List (§9-§11); when t follows, the reference is to a form in Terence; n is added to show that the form appears also in the footnote.

Numerals alone, or with letters other than t and n, indicate sections of this dissertation.

The letters *i* and *u* here represent both vowel and semivowel.

Variant forms, manuscript or conjectural, which I have rejected, are not listed in the Index.

ostenderunt ♯ 39.
pellexerunt ♯ 73.
perdidere ♯ 171 n : 40, 40 b[20].
perdiderunt 75.
perduxere ♯ 177 t.
perduxerunt ♯ 167.
periere ♯ 99, ♯ 102, ♯ 113, ♯ 127, ♯ 131, ♯ 161 n, ♯ 227 t : 20 a, 20 b, 24 c, 26, 41 e, 79, 81.
perierunt ♯ 5, ♯ 72, ♯ 130, ♯ 145 : 8, 41 a, 41 b, 41 e, 79.
pertulere ♯ 4 : 20 e.
petiere 79, 79[29].
petierunt 79[29].
placauere ♯ 125 : 25.
posuere 79.
potuere ♯ 60.
praebuerunt 79.
praeciderunt ♯ 93.
processerunt ♯ 105.
promiserunt ♯ 52.
protulerunt ♯ 54.
-pulerunt, cf. ap-, com-.
reddiderunt ♯ 42 n, ♯ 47 : 40 a.
redierunt ♯ 37 n, ♯ 182 t : 41 a, 41 b.
reliquere ♯ 23, ♯ 75 : 24 c.
reppererunt ♯ 155.
reprehenderunt ♯ 82.
resciuere ♯ 88 n.
sciuerunt ♯ 123 : 36 b.
scripsere 72[16], 76[24].
scripserunt 72[16].
senserunt ♯ 69 : 38 ; cf. con-.
statuerunt 75.
steterunt 83[33].
subegerunt ♯ 26 : 37.
sublegerunt ♯ 92.
subleuere ♯ 45 : 36 a.
succreuere ♯ 162 n : 36 a.
sumpserunt ♯ 153 : 78.
surrupuere ♯ 59.
suspendere ♯ 164 : 9[30], 24 c.
sustulere 79.
tetigere ♯ 55.
tetigerunt ♯ 14 : 38, 41 b.
tradiderunt ♯ 166.
transfugere ♯ 87 : 24 c.
transfugerunt ♯ 63.
trauolauerunt ♯ 65 : 9[26], 35.
triuerunt ♯ 136 : 36 b.
tulere, cf. per-, sus-.
tulerunt, cf. aps-, at-, dis-, pro-.
uenere ♯ 194 t, ♯ 207 t : 26, 31 ; cf. con-, e-.
uenerunt, cf. ad-, e-.
uexerunt ♯ 9.
uidere 79.
uoluere ♯ 22, ♯ 137 n : 25, 27.
uoluerunt ♯ 38 n : 11, 41 a.
uorterunt ♯ 169.

In the following instances, reference is made to perfect forms by number only :

♯ 11 : 40.
♯ 12 : 40.
♯ 13 : 24 b.
♯ 15 : 40.
♯ 17 : 40.
♯ 20 : 46[28].
♯ 22 : 46[28].
♯ 23 : 46[28].
♯ 25 : 40 b.
♯ 28 : 40 b, 46.
♯ 32 : 23.
♯ 42 : 40 b.
♯ 45 : 24 a.
♯ 46 : 13.
♯ 47 : 40.
♯ 51 : 40.
♯ 54 : 40.
♯ 55 : 24 b.
♯ 57 : 13.
♯ 58 : 46[28].
♯ 59 : 24 b.
♯ 60 : 24 a.
♯ 61 : 13.
♯ 62 : 40.
♯ 66 : 46[28].
♯ 68 : 13.
♯ 77 : 13.
♯ 78 : 13.
♯ 79 : 40.
♯ 87 : 46[28].
♯ 88 : 23.
♯ 97 : 40.
♯ 104 : 40 b.
♯ 106 : 23, 46[28].
♯ 108 : 46[28].
♯ 109 : 46.
♯ 111 : 13, 14, 14[10].
♯ 112 : 13, 14, 14[10].
♯ 113 : 14, 14[10], 46[28].

PROTAT BROTHERS, PRINTERS, MACON (FRANCE). — MCMXXXIII